

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLIII

AUGUST, 1945

NO. 992

Pius XII: Nazism and Peace

Address of Pope Pius XII to the Sacred College of Cardinals, June 2, 1945

AS We very gratefully acknowledge, Venerable Brethren, the good wishes which the venerable and beloved Dean of the Sacred College has offered to Us on your behalf, Our thoughts bring Us back to this day six years ago when you offered your congratulations on Our feast day for the first time after We, though unworthy, had been raised to the See of Peter.

The world was then still at peace: but what a peace and how very precarious!

With a heart full of anguish, perplexed, praying, We bent over that peace like one that assists a dying man and fights obstinately to save him from death even when all hope is gone.

The message which We then addressed to you reflected our sorrowful apprehension that the conflict which was ever growing more menacing would break out—a conflict whose

extent and duration nobody could foresee. The subsequent march of events has not only justified all too clearly our saddest premonitions but has far surpassed them.

Today, after six years, the fratricidal struggle has ended, at least in one section of this war-torn world. It is a peace—if you can call it such—as yet very fragile, which cannot endure or be consolidated except by expending on it the most assiduous care; a peace whose maintenance imposes on the whole Church, both pastors and faithful, grave and very delicate duties: patient prudence, courageous fidelity, the spirit of sacrifice!

All are called upon to devote themselves to it, each in his own office and at his own place. Nobody can bring to this task too much anxiety or zeal. As to Us and Our apostolic ministry, We well know, Venerable Brethren,

that We can safely count on your sage collaboration, your unceasing prayers, your steadfast devotion.

I.

THE CHURCH AND NATIONAL SOCIALISM

In Europe the war is over; but what wounds has it not inflicted! Our Divine Master has said: "All that take the sword shall perish by the sword" (*Matthew 26, 52*).

Now what do you see? You see what is the result of a concept of the State reduced to practice which takes no heed of the most sacred ideals of mankind, which overthrows the inviolable principles of the Christian Faith. The whole world today contemplates with stupefaction the ruins that it has left behind it. These ruins We had seen when they were still in the distant future, and few, We believe, have followed with greater anxiety the process leading to the inevitable, crash.

For over twelve years—twelve of the best years of Our mature age—We had lived in the midst of the German people, fulfilling the duties of the office committed to Us. During that time, in the atmosphere of liberty which the political and social conditions of that time allowed, We worked for consolidation of the status of the Catholic Church in Germany.

We thus had occasion to learn the great qualities of the people and We were personally in close contact with its most representative men. For that

reason We cherish the hope that it can rise to a new dignity and new life when once it has laid the satanic specter raised by National Socialism and the guilty (as We have already at other times had occasion to expound) have expiated the crimes they have committed.

GERMANY ASKED CONCORDAT

While there was still some faint glimmer of hope that that movement could take another and less disastrous course, either through the disillusionment of its more moderate members or through effective opposition from that section of German people which opposed it, the Church did everything possible to set up a formidable barrier to the spread of ideas at once subversive and violent.

In the spring of 1933 the German Government asked the Holy See to conclude a concordat with the Reich: the proposal had the approval of the Episcopate and of at least the greater number of the German Catholics.

In fact, they thought that neither the concordats up to then negotiated with some individual German states nor the Weimar Constitution gave adequate guarantee or assurance of respect for their convictions, for their faith, rights or liberty of action.

In such conditions the guarantees could not be secured except through a settlement having the solemn form of a concordat with the Central Government of the Reich.

It should be added that, since it was the Government that made the proposal, the responsibility for all regrettable consequences would have fallen on the Holy See if it had refused the proposed concordat.

CONCORDAT WAS HELPFUL

It was not that the Church for her part had any illusions built on excessive optimism or that, in concluding the concordat, She had the intention of giving any form of approval to the teachings or tendencies of National Socialism; this was expressly declared and explained at the time (Cf. *Osservatore Romano*, No. 174, July 2, 1933). It must, however, be recognized that the concordat in the years that followed brought some advantages or at least prevented worse evils.

In fact, in spite of all the violations to which it was subjected, it gave Catholics a juridical basis for their defense, a stronghold behind which to shield themselves in their opposition—as long as this was possible—to the ever growing campaign of religious persecution.

The struggle against the Church did, in fact, become ever more bitter: there was the dissolution of Catholic organizations; the gradual suppression of the flourishing Catholic schools, both public and private; the enforced weaning of youth from family and Church; the pressure brought to bear on the conscience of citizens and especially of civil servants; the systematic

defamation, by means of a clever, closely organized propaganda, of the Church, the clergy, the faithful, the Church's institutions, teaching and history; the closing, dissolution and confiscation of religious houses and other ecclesiastical institutions; the complete suppression of the Catholic press and publishing houses.

To resist such attacks millions of courageous Catholics, men and women, closed their ranks around their Bishops, whose valiant and severe pronouncements never failed to resound even in these last years of war. These Catholics gathered around their priests to help them adapt their ministry to the ever changing needs and conditions. And right up to the end they set up against the forces of impiety and pride their forces of faith, prayer and openly Catholic behavior and education.

In the meantime, the Holy See itself multiplied its representations and protests to governing authorities in Germany, reminding them in clear and energetic language of their duty to respect and fulfil the obligations of the natural law itself that were confirmed by the concordat.

In those critical years, joining the alert vigilance of a pastor to the long-suffering patience of a father, Our great predecessor, Pius XI, fulfilled his mission as Supreme Pontiff with intrepid courage. But when, after He had tried all means of persuasion in vain, He saw himself clearly faced

with deliberate violations of a solemn pact, with a religious persecution masked or open but always rigorously organized, He proclaimed to the world on Passion Sunday, 1937, in His Encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge*, what national socialism really was: the arrogant apostasy from Jesus Christ, the denial of His doctrine and of His work of redemption, the cult of violence, the idolatry of race and blood, the overthrow of human liberty and dignity. (*Catholic Mind*, May 8, 1937).

PAPAL CALL AWOKE MANY

Like a clarion call that sounds the alarm, the Papal document with its vigorous terms—too vigorous, thought more than one at the time—startled the minds and hearts of men. Many—even beyond the frontiers of Germany—who up to then had closed their eyes to the incompatibility of the National Socialist viewpoint with the teachings of Christ had to recognize and confess their mistake. Many—but not all! Some even among the faithful themselves were too blinded by their prejudices or allured by political advantage.

The evidence of the facts brought forward by Our predecessor did not convince them, much less induce them to change their ways. Is it mere chance that some regions, which later suffered more from the National Socialist system, were precisely those where the Encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge* was less or not at all heeded?

Would it then have been possible, by opportune and timely political action, to block once and for all the outbreak of brutal violence and to put the German people in the position to shake off the tentacles that were strangling it? Would it have been possible thus to have saved Europe and the world from this immense inundation of blood? Nobody would dare to give an unqualified judgment.

But in any case nobody could accuse the Church of not having denounced and exposed in time the true nature of the National Socialist movement and the danger to which it exposed Christian civilization.

NAZI HOSTILITY SUMMED UP

"Whoever sets up race or the people or the state or a particular form of state or the depositaries' power or any other fundamental value of the human community to be the supreme norm of all, even of religious values, and divinizes them to an idolatrous level, distorts and perverts an order of the world planned and created by God." (Cf. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Vol. XXIX, 1937, pages 149 and 171.)

The radical opposition of the National Socialist State to the Catholic Church is summed up in this declaration of the Encyclical. When things had reached this point, the Church could not, without foregoing Her mission, any longer refuse to take Her stand before the whole world.

But by doing so She became once again "a sign which shall be contradicted" (*Luke 2, 34*), in the presence of which contrasting opinions divided off into two opposed camps.

German Catholics were, one may say, at one in recognizing that the Encyclical *Mit Brennender Sorge* had brought light, direction, consolation and comfort to all those who seriously meditated and conscientiously practiced the religion of Christ. But the reaction of those who had been inculcated was inevitable, and, in fact, that very year, 1937, was for the Catholic Church in Germany a year of indescribable bitterness and terrible outbreaks.

OPPOSITION WAS INTENSIFIED

The important political events which marked the two following years and then the war did not bring an attenuation to the hostility of National Socialism toward the Church, a hostility which was manifest up to these last months, when National Socialists still flattered themselves with the idea that once they had secured victory in arms they could do away with the Church forever.

Authoritative and absolutely trustworthy witnesses kept Us informed of these plans—they unfolded themselves actually in the reiterated and ever more intense activity against the Church in Austria, Alsace-Lorraine and, above all, in those parts of Poland which had already been incorpo-

rated in the old Reich during the war: there everything was attacked and destroyed; that is, everything that could be reached by external violence.

Continuing the work of Our predecessor, We ourselves have during the war especially in Our radio messages constantly set forth the demands and perennial laws of humanity and of the Christian Faith in contrast with the ruinous and inexorable applications of National Socialist teachings, which even went so far as to use the most exquisite scientific methods to torture or eliminate people who were often innocent.

This was for Us the most opportune—and We might even say the only—efficacious way of proclaiming before the world the immutable principles of the moral law and of confirming, in the midst of so much error and violence, the minds and hearts of German Catholics in the higher ideals of truth and justice. And Our solicitude was not without its effect. Indeed, We know that Our messages, and especially that of Christmas, 1942, despite every prohibition and obstacle, were studied in the diocesan clergy conferences in Germany and then expounded and explained to the Catholic population.

If the rulers of Germany had decided to destroy the Catholic Church even in the old Reich, Providence had decided otherwise. The tribulations inflicted on the Church by National Socialism have been brought to an

end through the sudden and tragic end of the persecution! From the prisons, concentration camps and fortresses are now pouring out, together with the political prisoners, also the crowds of those, whether clergy or laymen, whose only crime was their fidelity to Christ and to the Faith of their Fathers or the dauntless fulfillment of their duties as priests.

For them, all of us have prayed and have seized every opportunity, whenever the occasion offered, to send them a word of comfort and blessing from Our paternal heart.

POLISH PRIESTS FARED WORST

Indeed, the more the veils are drawn which up to now hid the sorrowful passion of the Church under the National Socialist regime, the more apparent becomes the strength, often steadfast unto death, of numberless Catholics and the glorious share in that noble contest which belonged to the clergy.

Although as yet not in possession of the complete statistics, We cannot refrain from recalling here, by way of example, some details from the abundant accounts which have reached us from priests and laymen who were interned in the concentration camp of Dachau and were accounted worthy to suffer reproach for the name of Jesus (*Acts 5, 41*).

In the forefront, for the number and harshness of the treatment meted out to them, are the Polish priests.

From 1940 to 1945, 2,800 Polish ecclesiastics and religious were imprisoned in that camp; among them was a Polish auxiliary bishop who died there of typhus. In April last, there were left only 816, all the others being dead except for two or three transferred to another camp.

In the summer of 1942, 480 German-speaking ministers of religion were known to be gathered there; of these, forty-five were Protestants, all the others Catholic priests. In spite of the continuous inflow of new internees, especially from some dioceses of Bavaria, the Rhineland and Westphalia, their number, as a result of the high rate of mortality, at the beginning of this year did not surpass 350.

Nor should we pass over in silence those belonging to occupied territories, Holland, Belgium, France (among whom the Bishop of Clermont), Luxembourg, Slovenia, Italy.

SUFFERINGS "INDESCRIBABLE"

Many of those priests and laymen endured indescribable sufferings for their Faith and for their vocation.

In one case the hatred of the impious against Christ reached the point of parodying on the person of an interned priest, with barbed wire, the scourging and the crowning with thorns of our Redeemer.

The generous victims who during the twelve years since 1933 have in Germany sacrificed for Christ and His Church their possessions, their free-

dom, their lives, are raising their hands to God in expiatory sacrifice. May the just Judge accept it in reparation for the many crimes committed against mankind no less than against the present and future generation and especially against the unfortunate youth of Germany, and may He at last stay the arm of the exterminating angel!

With ever-increasing persistence National Socialism strove to denounce the Church as the enemy of the German people. The manifest injustice of the accusation would have deeply offended the sentiment of German Catholics and Our own if it had come from other lips. But on the lips of such accusers, so far from being a grievance, the accusation is the clearest and most honorable testimony to the strong, incessant opposition maintained by the Church to such disastrous doctrines and methods in the interest of true civilization and of the German people. To that people We offer the wish that, freed now from the error which plunged it into chaos, it may find again its own salvation at the pure fountains of true peace and true happiness, at the fountains of truth, humility and charity flowing with the Church from the Heart of Christ.

II.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

A hard-learned lesson surely, that of these past years! God grant at least

that it may have been understood and be profitable to other nations!

"Receive instruction, you that judge the earth!" (*Psalms* 2, 10).

That is the most ardent wish of all who sincerely love mankind. For mankind, now the victim of an impious process of exhaustion, of cynical disregard for the life and rights of men, has but one aspiration: to lead a tranquil and pacific life in dignity and honest toil. And to this purpose it hopes that an end will be put to that insolence with which the family and the domestic hearth have been abused and profaned during the war years.

For that insolence cries to heaven and has evolved into one of the gravest perils not only for religion and morality but also for harmonious relations between men. It has, above all, created those mobs of dispossessed, disillusioned, disappointed and hopeless men who are going to swell the ranks of revolution and disorder, in the pay of a tyranny no less despotic than those for whose overthrow men planned.

The nations, and notably the medium and small nations, claim the right to take their destinies into their own hands. They can be led to assume, with their full and willing consent, in the interest of common progress, obligations which will modify their sovereign rights.

But after having sustained their share—their large share—of suffering in order to overthrow a system of

brutal violence, they are entitled to refuse to accept a new political or cultural system which is decisively rejected by the great majority of their people. They maintain, and with reason, that the primary task of the peace-framers is to put an end to the criminal war game and to safeguard vital rights and mutual obligations as between the great and small, powerful and weak.

Deep in their hearts the peoples feel that their rule would be discredited if they did not succeed in supplanting the mad folly of the rule of violence by the victory of the right.

The thought of a new peace organization is inspired—nobody could doubt it—by the most sincere and loyal good will. The whole of mankind follows the progress of this noble enterprise with anxious interest. What a bitter disillusionment it would be if it were to fail, if so many years of suffering and self-sacrifice were to be made vain, by permitting again to prevail that spirit of oppression from which the world hoped to see itself at last freed once and for all!

Poor world, to which then might be applied the words of Christ: "And the last state of that man becomes worse than the first" (*Luke* 11, 24-26).

The present political and social situation suggests these words of warning to us. We have had, alas, to deplore in more than one region the murder of priests, deportations of

civilians, the killing of citizens without trial or in personal vendetta. No less sad is the news that has reached us from Slovenia and Croatia.

But We will not lose heart. The speeches made by competent and responsible men in the course of the last few weeks made it clear that they are aiming at the triumph of right, not merely as a political goal, but even more as a moral duty.

Accordingly, We confidently issue an ardent appeal for prayers to Our sons and daughters of the whole world. May it reach all those who recognize in God the beloved Father of all men created to His image and likeness, to all who know that in the breast of Christ there beats a Divine Heart rich in mercy, deep and inexhaustible fountain of all good and all love, of all peace and all reconciliation.

From the cessation of hostilities to true and genuine peace, as We warned not long ago, the road will be long and arduous, too long for the pent-up aspiration of mankind starving for order and calm. But it is inevitable that it should be so.

CALLS FOR PEACEFUL DESIGNS

It is even perhaps better thus. It is essential that the tempest of over-excited passions be first let subside: *Motos praestat componere fluctus* (Virgil, *Aeneid* 1, 135).

It is essential that the hate, the diffidence, the stimuli of an extreme nationalism should give way to the

growth of wise counsels, the flowering of peaceful designs, to serenity in the interchange of views and to mutual brotherly comprehension.

May the Holy Spirit, light of intellects, gentle ruler of hearts, deign to hear the prayers of His church and guide in their arduous work those who in accordance with their mandate are striving sincerely, despite obstacles and contradictions, to reach the goal so universally, so ardently, desired: peace, a peace worthy of the name; a peace built and consolidated in sincerity and loyalty, in justice and reality; a peace of loyal and resolute force to overcome or preclude those economic and social conditions which might, as they did in the past, easily lead to new conflicts; a peace that can be approved by all right-minded men of every people and every nation; a peace which future generations may regard gratefully as the happy outcome of a sad period; a peace that may stand out in the centuries as a resolute advance in the affirmation of human dignity and of ordered liberty; a peace that may be like the Magna Charta which closed the dark age of violence; a peace that under the merci-

ful guidance of God may let us so pass through temporal prosperity that we may not lose eternal happiness (cf. Collect, third Sunday after Pentecost).

But before reaching this peace it still remains true that millions of men at their own fireside or in battle, in prison or in exile, must still drink their bitter chalice. How We long to see the end of their sufferings and anguish, the realization of their hopes! For them, too, and for all mankind that suffers with them and in them may Our humble and ardent prayer ascend to Almighty God.

Meanwhile, Venerable Brethren, We are immensely comforted by the thought that you share Our anxieties, Our prayers, Our hopes; and that throughout the world Bishops, priests and faithful are joining their supplications to Ours in the great chorus of the Universal Church.

In testimony of Our deep gratitude and as a pledge of infinite mercies and Divine favors, with sincere affection, We impart to you, to them, to all who join Us in desiring and working for peace, Our Apostolic Benediction.



War Criminals

Justice demands that none of the guilty war criminals escape, but at the same time it must be clear that the characteristic of criminals is that they are individuals.—*Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago.*

The Bells of St. Mary's

Reprinted from the *TIDINGS**

THE cameras have finished turning on "The Bells of St. Mary's," Leo McCarey's follow-up to his phenomenal success "Going My Way."

Dreams and hopes, which through 11 months of tireless effort shaped themselves into ideas in the mind of this sensitive man, now are fixed in printed images and unchangeable dialogue on several hundreds of thousands of feet of celluloid.

These must be edited, fitted with music and finally compressed into a screenplay taking up less than two hours of screen time. The film should be ready for public release by late summer or early fall. When it reaches the screen I believe it will prove every bit as noteworthy as "Going My Way."

The *Tidings* and its readers from the very beginning were more than interested spectators in the filming of this novel story about nuns.

Through the Motion Picture department, ideas and anecdotes by the thousands found their way to Producer-Director Leo McCarey who, while unable to make use of more than a fractional percentage of them, did immerse himself in the spirit they suggested. It would be impossible to over-estimate their value in helping Mr. McCarey to set the tone of his story and to build his characters true to life.

During every phase of the filming this department has been taken into McCarey's confidence. Most of the film as it was shot has been shown to us on the screen. We have witnessed and sometimes been responsible for suggesting various changes made to the script as the work progressed and, although not new to us as an experience, we never got half as much kick out of following the progress of any movie as we got out of "The Bells of St. Mary's."

It has been said that McCarey makes up his screenplays as he goes along. This is partially true.

Having decided what his main characters are to stand for and where their activities will give rise to conflict and achievement, he starts his cameras rolling.

The dialogue, written in this instance by Dudley Nichols, undergoes frequent revision as the play goes on.

* 3241 S. Figueroa St., Los Angeles, Calif., June 1, 1945

Sometimes whole sequences are rearranged and certain of the characters accented to point up the main purposes McCarey has had in mind from the start.

FATHER DEVLIN TECHNICAL ADVISOR

In "The Bells of St. Mary's" many such changes were decided upon as a result of close cooperation between McCarey and Rev. John J. Devlin, studio representative of His Excellency, Archbishop John J. Cantwell.

As West Coast secretary of the Legion of Decency, Fr. Devlin, whose work in Hollywood represents the most constructive approach to better motion pictures ever envisaged by Legion officials, has assumed responsibility for complete technical direction of "The Bells of St. Mary's." It is a practical certainty that the film, like "Going My Way," will receive Legion endorsement as suitable for any and every movie audience.

Not only Leo McCarey, but Charles Koerner, production head of RKO who will distribute the film, Bing Crosby, Ingrid Bergman and every member of the cast and working company, deserves appreciation and unstinted support of Catholics everywhere. For they have brought conscience as well as confidence to the realization of a big and beautiful task.

NO DELIBERATE PROPAGANDA

It should be understood that, although the producer-director and many of his cast—Bing Crosby, William Gargan, Una O'Connor and Joan Carroll to mention a few—are Catholics, "The Bells of St. Mary's" is not conceived in terms of Catholic advocacy. It is made purely as entertainment and will doubtless emerge as vibrantly human, delightfully amusing and richly humorous screen fare.

We venture that far on what we have seen.

McCarey answers occasional criticism that he is pressing his genius for story telling into the service of the Church, by pointing out that "to attempt to sell Catholicism in a movie would be futile because Catholics do not need that kind of thing and non-Catholics would not take it."

"The Bells of St. Mary's" is a life-like story of Sisters who teach school. We see how they, especially Sister Superior Benedict (Ingrid Bergman), reacts to the arrival of the new pastor, Fr. Charles O'Malley (Bing Crosby). We recognize from life the problems they must face in bringing the truths of Christian faith to children affected by all kinds of personal and domestic difficulties common to our day and age.

There is no preaching. It is not in McCarey's line to preach.

The story deals lightly, logically and delightfully with such important concerns as the power of prayer, the grace of faith, the meaning of the religious vocation, the dignity of human souls, the social effects of marital fidelity and family unity, the justice of self-defense against evil and the transcendent virtue of spiritual over material realities.

Yet nowhere is there a pawky argument or a single touch of the theatrical in presenting what is likely to prove the first true depiction of the Sisterhood upon the movie screen.

DESERVES CATHOLIC PRESS SUPPORT

The *Tidings*, through its Film Information Bureau, now begins the task of securing for "The Bells of St. Mary's," in every progressive Catholic newspaper and magazine within the U. S. A., fittingly generous editorial support and encouragement.

If the Catholic press fails to encourage the production of a movie like this, it forfeits its right to complain when Hollywood turns out movies that are neither morally good nor entertaining.



Cooperation Among Christians

I am wholeheartedly in support of the arrangement by which the Sword of the Spirit should work on parallel lines in regard to religious issues and have joint cooperation with members of other religious bodies in the social sphere. All men of goodwill ought to unite in trying to restore Christian principles in social matters. It has been pointed out several times that the Sword of the Spirit is a Catholic movement and I hope that it will receive even greater support from the Catholics of this country.

I have had a letter from the Archbishop of Canterbury, in reply to mine congratulating him on his appointment, saying how anxious he is that we should continue this cooperation in the social sphere.—*Archbishop Griffin to the Sword of the Spirit Council, March 24, 1945.*

Federal Aid For Catholic Schools

FELIX NEWTON PITT

THE question of the relation of the State and the school is ever old and ever new. It is a perennial problem which springs up constantly with the shifting of political power and the development of education. The enormous implications of the relation of education and the State have been exemplified in Europe during the past twenty-five years. A major factor in the rise to power of Mussolini and Hitler and Stalin was the absolute control and direction these men exercised over the education of the young. It was no accident which caused the Dictators to assume complete control of the school. They knew and understood that through the school they could mold the minds and hearts of the children and thus entrench their hold upon the country and the people. The relation of the school to the State and of the State to the school will be a major question in the new governments to emerge in the post-war world.

In our own country also we have witnessed changes in both education and political government, but, of course, on no such radical scale as occurred in Europe. Education has made enormous strides at least in a horizontal direction in the United States. Schools on all levels have

*Paper read at the Annual Meeting of the Department of Diocesan Superintendents of Schools, The National Catholic Educational Association, held in New York, November 9-10, 1944. Reprinted from the Catholic Educational Review.**

increased in numbers; the school population until quite recent times grew rapidly, and the curriculum has quadrupled in the past fifty years. Costs of education have soared. Inequalities in economic development in the various sections of our country have brought about inequalities of educational opportunities. This growth and development, with consequent increased costs, have turned the eyes of many educators towards the Federal Government.

This looking to the central government for aid raises a new question for Americans in regard to the relations of the state and education. Coincident with shifting of local responsibility has been the slow but steady increase of centralization of power and influence in the Federal Government with a consequent lessening of the independence of the different States. Such a shifting of power from the States and local groups may be

* 1326 Quincy St., N.E., Washington 17, D. C., February, 1945.

a natural development under the changing modern conditions. It has not been many years since communications between Washington and the several States was a slow and cumbersome affair. Then of necessity each State had to stand on its own feet and solve its own problems. Then, too, they did not have so many problems or such costly ones, such as automobile highways and the like. Now communications are instantaneous. Inter-state problems are many and perplexing. Experience has shown that the central government can solve these problems much more effectively than the state-parties at issue.

If isolation is no longer possible in the sphere of international relations, it is no longer possible for States within a nation. Whatever may be the cause and whether we like it or not, the Federal Government today wields more power over the country at large than ever before. This development is bound sooner or later to have great influence on education in every part of our land.

Two new ideas have had tremendous influence on education in this country, namely, secularization and state control of education. The first, secularization, is an American idea though not new. It was and is a pagan idea, supplanted by Christianity but revived and restored by the Protestant Reformation. It came into our American schools quite early but was not definitely accepted as a general

policy until after the Civil War. The second idea, that education belongs to the state, is of German origin. It was implanted here by Horace Mann and the many American educators who attended the German Universities between 1820 and 1850. Now this idea is almost universally accepted by public school educators. It is hardly ever questioned by them. It is simply taken for granted as a fundamental principle.

These four factors again revive the whole problem of the relation of the State and education. The shifting of power from the State to the central government, the unequal growth and development of our school system, secularization in education, and the assumption that education is the function of the state primarily, force us in the United States to analyze anew the relation of school to state, and state to school. Each one of these factors has been considered many times and we have some pretty clear ideas about them. The proposal which is an outgrowth of these factors and which has elicited most widespread discussion, is Federal aid to education.

NEW PHASES OF AN OLD PROBLEM

During the past twenty years this question of Federal relation to the schools has passed from a movement to inaugurate a Department of Education to control the schools of the nation, to a mere request on the part of the States for financial aid without

control. This is the present demand which brings up again the perennial problem of state and education. Articles on this question are appearing more frequently in current periodicals. President Roosevelt, hitherto opposed to the granting of such aid, came out for it. Both the President and the National Education Association emphatically decry any Federal control or interference with local school authorities.

Hence the question now assumes a new phase. At least the present emphasis is for aid and against control. We have been strongly opposed to aid plus control. In the light of this new phase there are two questions facing us today. First, shall we change our traditional attitude and favor Federal aid to education? Second, does such aid necessarily involve Federal control or undue and unwanted interference? To provide a background for discussion of these two important questions, I wish to reiterate principles which have been always held by the Church. For these principles we go to philosophy and the Encyclicals of the Popes.

WHAT DOES PHILOSOPHY SAY?

The end of the state is to promote the welfare of its citizens. The state or civil society is not a voluntary or optional association. It is a necessary society, a society which men are morally bound to establish and maintain. This obligation arises from the

fact that without a political organization and government, men cannot adequately develop as men, or live right and reasonable lives. God has so made human beings that the state is necessary for their welfare. Hence man has a moral obligation to support the state. Following St. Thomas, Pope Leo XIII said in his *Christian Constitution of States*:

Man's natural instinct moves him to live in social society, for he cannot, if dwelling apart, provide himself with the necessary requirements of life, nor procure the means of developing his mental and moral faculties. . . . Civil society exists for the common good, and hence is concerned with the interests of all in general, albeit with individual interests in their due place and degree.

This, then, is the general end or purpose of the state; the promotion of human welfare and the common good.

The two words "common good" express concisely the purpose for which the state exists and functions. Under this term are included all the great classes of temporal goods, that is, all the things man needs for existence and development in this life. They comprise all spiritual, intellectual, moral, physical and economic goods; that is, all the external goods of body and soul. Hence it is the right and duty of the state to protect and further the religious interests of its citizens, to promote within due limits their education, to protect their morals against external dangers, and to facilitate moral education; to safeguard the liberty and bodily integrity

of the citizens from undue restraint, malicious attack and preventable accident; and to protect private property and provide the citizens with a reasonable opportunity of obtaining a livelihood and advancing their material welfare.¹

That all these objects are conducive to human welfare, is self-evident; that none of them can be adequately attained without the assistance of the state, is demonstrated by experience; that they all come within the proper scope and end of the state is the obvious conclusion. Cronin sums up the question thus:

The measure of the state function is to be found in the necessities of man and the inability of the individual and the family to provide these necessities. Anything, therefore, which is necessary, whether for the individual or for society at large, and which the individual or the family is not in a position to supply, may legitimately be regarded as included in the end of the state.²

Philosophers frequently classify the functions of the state into necessary and optional, or essential and non-essential. The necessary or essential or primary functions are military, financial and civil. The optional or non-essential or secondary functions are calculated to increase and promote the general welfare, but they could conceivably be performed in some fashion by private agencies. They comprise public works, public education, public charity, industrial,

health and safety regulations. Public education may include not only a system of schools, but museums, libraries, art galleries and scientific bureaus, such as those connected with weather and agriculture.

It should be noted here that the difference between the primary and secondary functions of the state is not a difference of kind but only of degree. The primary functions are not really sufficient. The state must not only safeguard rights, but promote the general good by positive measures of helpfulness. This is the general principle. In carrying it out, the state may properly undertake some particular activities which are not obligatory, but only more or less expedient.

One of the most important of these secondary functions of the state is education. Against this we have the fundamental principle based on the natural law, that as the child belongs primarily to the parents, so the function of education is primarily theirs. But how can the parents fulfil this function? Except in very rare cases, parents cannot give their children an education personally. They must delegate this function to others, to professional teachers, to the school. Hence it is more correct to say that the parents have the responsibility and the duty to provide educational opportunities for their children. *Facit per alium facit per se.*

The proper function of the state

¹ *Catholic Principles of Politics*, Ryan and Boland.

² *Ethics*, Vol. II, p. 474.

in respect to education is an auxiliary one, to help the parents who are citizens of the state to fulfil their responsibility. The state is acting within its own sphere in providing schools for all, if this is the will of the people. In a truly Christian state providing a true Christian education for its citizens, parents may, in all conscience, fulfil their duty and educational function by sending their children to the state schools. This is also the case in countries where the state is not a Christian state but one which recognizes the rights of parents, e. g., Quebec and Ontario in Canada, and Holland and Switzerland. Hence the real question is not whether the state has a right to educate but what kind of state it is and what kind of education does the state provide? No one denies the right of the state to conduct schools. It has both the right and the duty, as is clear from the auxiliary status of the state in respect to the family.

The state may also organize and conduct schools in its own right. The source of this right is the end of the state, the common good or general welfare. This is particularly true in a democracy. The American Bishops' Pastoral Letter of 1920 states this clearly.

As the public welfare is largely dependent upon the intelligence of its citizens, the state has a vital concern in education. . . . The state has a right to insist that its citizens shall be educated.

It should encourage among the people such a love of learning that they will take the initiative and, without constraint, provide for the education of their children. Should they, through negligence or *lack of means* fail to do so, the state has the right to establish schools and take every other legitimate means to safeguard its vital interests against the dangers that result from ignorance.

It might be added that one of the best means to encourage love of learning is the establishment of schools by the state and the most effective means of assuring an educated citizenry would be to see to it that children attend school.

WHAT DOES THE POPE SAY?

The Encyclical on *The Christian Education of Youth* of Pope Pius XI also states these principles clearly.

The family holds directly from the Creator Himself the mission, and hence the right, to educate the offspring. This right is inalienable because it is inseparably bound with a strict obligation; it is anterior to any right whatsoever of civil society and therefore may not be violated by any earthly power. . . . Common welfare in the temporal order consists in that peace and security wherein families and citizens have the free exercise of their right, and at the same time enjoy that measure of spiritual and temporal well-being which is possible in this life, through the mutual union and co-ordination of the work of all. The civil authority therefore has a twofold function to fulfil, namely, to *protect* and to *promote* the interests of the family and the individual; but it must not absorb them nor substitute itself for them. Accordingly, in the matter of education, it is

the right or, more properly, the duty of the state by its legislation to protect the above-mentioned prior rights of the family as regards the Christian education of their offspring, and to respect the supernatural right of the Church in the same matter.

Again, this Encyclical insists:

It is likewise the duty of the state to protect the rights of the child when parents fail with regard to the physical or moral education of their offspring, whether this be due to their incapacity or to their willful neglect.

The state has a right to do this on two grounds: first,

The right of the parents to educate their children is not an absolute or despotic one; it is dependent on the natural and the divine law, and therefore subject to the authority and judgment of the Church, as well as the vigilance and administrative care of the state, in view of the common good.

And secondly:

The family is not a perfect society; that is, it does not possess in itself all the means necessary for its full development. In these exceptional cases the state does not usurp the place of the family; it merely supplies its deficiencies, providing suitable means to fill a real need: and therein the state acts in perfect conformity with the rights of the children and the supernatural rights of the Church.

Moreover, according to the Encyclical, the state should guard education from all evil influences and take positive measures to promote education. Merely to protect education would not be enough. The state has a responsibility actively to foster education. To fulfil this responsibility the Holy Father says the state

must promote religious and moral education, and support the family and the Church in that work. In this respect the Encyclical adds a statement which has a direct and positive bearing on the question of state aid:

It (the state) should, by means of its own schools and institutions, supplement their (of Church and Family) work wherever this falls short of what is necessary. The state is in a better position to do this than any other society, since it has at its disposal public money, which is to be used for the needs of the community. It is only just that the state should use this money for the benefit of those who have contributed it.

The state should also promote the general culture of its citizens. Here civic education is given specific mention and emphasis. Finally the state must promote education especially by a regular system of schools. The right of the state to build schools is clearly recognized by the Pope. But he refuses to admit that a state has any monopoly of education. In regard to the relations between the state and Catholic schools, the Encyclical adds the following significant statement:

And let no one say that in a nation where there are different religious beliefs, it is impossible to provide for public instruction otherwise than by neutral or mixed schools. In such a case it becomes the duty of the state, indeed it is the easier and more reasonable method of procedure, to leave free scope to the initiative of the Church and the family, *while giving them such assistance as justice demands*. That this can be done to the full

satisfaction of families, and to the advantage of education and of public peace and tranquility, is clear from the actual experience of some countries comprising different religious denominations. There the school legislation respects the rights of the family, and Catholics are free to follow their own system of teaching in schools that are entirely Catholic. Nor is distributive justice lost sight of, as is evidenced by the financial aid granted by the state to the several schools demanded by the families.

The Encyclical then goes on to refer to other countries where the people have to make severe sacrifices for their own schools. Here undoubtedly Pius XI had in mind the United States as well as several other countries. The Holy Father adds:

If such education is not aided from public funds, *as distributive justice requires*, certainly it may not be opposed by any civil authority. And further, "Let it be loudly proclaimed and well understood and recognized by all, that Catholics, no matter what their nationality, in agitating for Catholic schools for their children, are not mixing in party politics, but are engaged in a religious enterprise demanded by conscience."

MUST THE STATE SUPPORT PRIVATE SCHOOLS?

A. Ottaviani, in his work *Summa Iuris Publici Ecclesiastici*, Vol. II, p. 230, makes a very definite statement concerning the duty of the state to support other than public schools on the grounds of justice. A state which supports only public schools, he says, helps only a part of the citizen parents, while those who support other kinds

of schools for reasons of conscience are deprived of all aid to which they have a right by reason of their tax contribution. The state, then, in justice, should maintain the schools of the minority whose conscience will not permit them to use the public schools. If the state will not maintain such schools, it should give assistance to the schools conducted by such a minority in proportion to the support it gives the public schools.

Cronin in his *Science of Ethics*, Vol. II, pp. 488-489, states a similar doctrine:

The state. . . should provide also schools approved by parents, and equip and maintain them at the expense of the state, provided of course, that the requisite number of families is present to constitute a school. In that case, as in every case in which public money is devoted to any work, the state enjoys a full right of inspection and examination so that the public may have some guarantee that its money is being properly applied. . . . Where reasonable aid is asked of the state, aid should be given; but in seeking such aid men are not to be regarded as forfeiting or surrendering in any way the rights and liberties which nature bestows upon them as human persons, or as parents entrusted with the duty of caring for their children. Nobody would, of course, expect the state to provide schools for every handful of children whose parents entertain conscientious objection to the system that is actually provided by the state. But wherever a multiplicity of schools has to be provided, the state is bound to make such provisions for any large and important body of parents making common appeal to the state, and resting this appeal on the

same group of conscientious principles or difficulties.

This would seem to be a clear mandate for Catholics to ask for financial aid from the state for their schools. Since they contribute by taxes to education, they have a right, as the Pope points out, to a share of their contribution. This right is founded in distributive justice. That public schools can function in which the conscience rights of parents are not only respected but fostered, we need only look to find it true in Canada, the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario, England, Scotland, Ireland, Holland, Belgium and Switzerland. A satisfactory solution has also been found in other European countries and in South America. As a matter of fact, our country is one of very few that does not aid religious schools.

On basic principles, then, there can be no opposition to our schools receiving financial aid from the state. On the contrary, the very nature and function of the state in respect to education demands such aid. As has been pointed out the function of the state in regard to education is primarily auxiliary, to assist the family in its prime task of education. The state is doing it to a small degree in many places in our own country. As a matter of history, prior to 1860 there were thousands of instances of direct public aid to private and church

schools in all the states of our Union.³

FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The specific problem facing us today, as it has faced us for the past twenty-five years, is Federal aid to public schools. I say public schools, for the question of Catholic schools sharing in such aid has hardly been discussed. The question of Federal relation to the schools first appeared in 1870 with the Hoar bill for a Department of Education. Between 1881-87, the Blair bills appeared regularly. The first real attempt to put the schools under Federal financial control appeared with the Smith-Towner bill before the 65th Congress in 1918. This was an extravagant proposal for large federal grants to be administered by a Federal Department of Education with a Secretary in the President's Cabinet. Practically the same bill was introduced again in the 66th, 67th, and 68th Congresses. None of these bills were ever reported out of Committee but they did stir up an enormous amount of discussion throughout the country.

For thirteen years no further attempt was made and the question was hardly raised. The proposal for aid from the Federal government was revived in 1936 and since then seven bills have been introduced. Of the seven bills introduced since 1936 only two have ever been reported out of Committee and none have seriously threatened to become law.

³ Cf. Gabel, *Public Funds for Church and Private Schools*, passim. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America, 1937.

The campaign was engineered almost wholly by the professional educational politicians of the N.E.A. The opposition was a powerful, compact group representing the private schools and universities, with the Catholic group foremost and most vocal in protest. This line-up of opposing forces has remained essentially the same throughout the history of this struggle. At no time did any Catholic educator take a different stand until 1942 when Rev. Charles J. Mahoney, Associate Superintendent of Schools of Rochester, in an article entitled *The Organization of the Diocesan School System*, advocated a change in our viewpoint toward Federal aid,⁴ and within the current year an article in the *Commonweal* called for a new and more favorable attitude.

The chief argument for Federal aid to education was that it was the only way to raise the general level of education all over the country. The unequal economic resources of the States and sections of the United States brought about inequality of educational opportunity. The proponents of this movement claimed that the only way this inequality could be overcome would be for the Federal government to aid the needy.

The basic argument of the opponents was fear of Federal control.

The Federal Constitution has nothing to say about education and left this important function to the people of the different States. Our schools have from the beginning of our country been solely under local control and it was feared if the Federal government gave money for education, this traditional local control would be lost and we should have a nation-wide system of national education directed from the Capitol in Washington.

Incidentally, one of the surprising aspects of this increasing demand for federal aid has been the attitude of the present Administration. This attitude has been one of strong opposition despite the policy of the Roosevelt Administration for intervention by the Federal government in the economic and social interests of the people. This opposition, however, seems to have become tempered quite recently, for the President at the White House Conference on Rural Education said: "It (the Government) must purely and simply provide the guarantee that this country is big enough to give to all of its children the right to a free education." But, the President added, "Governmental financial aid should, of course, never involve government interference with State and local administration and control."

This fear of control has been greatly enhanced by the experience of several European countries, particularly Italy, France and Germany.

⁴ *Essays on Catholic Education in the United States*, edited by Prof. Roy J. Deferrari. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University Press, 1942. pp. 88-91.

Control of all the schools by the central government under modern conditions means a greater or less approach to totalitarian conditions. The government which holds the purse-strings and thus controls the type of teaching imparted, will tend to impose its own ideology on the classroom and perhaps even exclude from teaching all instructors who refuse to conform to it. There is strong reason to believe that it is precisely this fear of totalitarian control of the schools which has thus far preserved us from Federal control of education.

SHOULD WE FAVOR FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS?

But now we are told that no one, from the President down, wants Federal control. All that is wanted is Federal aid to the several States to overcome inequality in educational opportunity. If this were really an honest presentation of the case, could we Catholic educators in conscience oppose it? We know full well there are rich States and poor States. We know, too, that the poorer States cannot possibly provide full educational opportunity for their children without outside assistance. In helping these poor States would not the Federal Government be fulfilling its proper auxiliary function and duty? We have the same inequality among our Catholic schools. There are rich dioceses and poor ones, wealthy par-

ishes and poverty-stricken ones. Because of this inequality of resources we have about fifty per cent of our children in Catholic schools.

If the proponents of Federal aid would include all schools, both public and private, would we still oppose such aid? Obviously we could not, on the grounds of the state exceeding its authority or stepping out of its proper role. Financial aid to private schools, now supported by parents for reasons of conscience, would be right in line with the auxiliary character of the state's relation to education. Nor could we oppose it on the grounds that it is contrary to the teaching of the Church, since we have from the Church itself, in the person of Pope Pius XI, in his Encyclical on Christian Education, the mandate to demand state aid. There is no principle of philosophy or theology on which we could refuse such state aid as is given to assist the family in carrying out its responsibility to see that the children are given the kind of education the parents wish.

Here, of course, we mean by state the civil power in general. In the United States we have forty-eight States within the framework of the Federal Union. There has been little or no opposition on the part of Catholics to receiving financial aid for their schools from the local State. On the contrary, more than one fight has been made for it. The latest attempt was

made in Ohio a few years ago. Hence our traditional opposition has not been to state aid in general but to aid from the Federal government. We favor aid to our schools from tax funds raised by the several States but are opposed to aid from tax funds raised by the Federal government. This attitude is difficult to reconcile with the basic and philosophical principles of the state and education which we advocate.

On what grounds, then, could we oppose Federal aid? It would all depend on what such aid involves. If it would mean complete control, then it would be extremely dangerous, to say the least, to accept Federal aid. Complete control of our schools would open the way to anything and everything. We Catholics have no reason to trust the modern state, even our own. This, I think, is the crux of the whole question: how much and what kind of control would the reception of financial aid from the Federal government entail?

To answer this question is not easy. Quite a few of our non-Catholic educators and practically all of our Catholic educators fear the resultant control would be too much and not the right kind. Is this fear well-grounded? Certainly Federal aid would necessarily involve some measure of fiscal control. No one, not even the Federal government, is going to bestow large sums of money upon either public or private schools with-

out some kind of check to see that the money is not wasted. In fact, some control is necessary since the money granted is the people's money for the spending of which the government has full responsibility. Perhaps the only evidence we can find to base any prediction on is experience. How much and what kind of control has the Federal government exercised in the past, or is exercising at present upon activities which it is financing?

ARE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS NOW FREE OF STATE CONTROL?

First of all, our Catholic schools are now practically under local State control without receiving any financial aid. All the States of the Union have, either by Constitutional provisions or legislative enactments, assumed a general jurisdiction of non-public schools. Generally this involves some kind of approval either tacitly or explicitly stated. In most States such control is not a grievous burden, but nevertheless the authority is there and the States could place our schools in embarrassing predicaments if they chose.

If then the burden is already on our shoulders, there is good reason why we should ask that the State help us bear it, as we have done in several instances. There is, of course, the ever-present danger that if the States did aid the non-public schools financially, they would feel freer to exercise the authority they already

possess. As a matter of fact, in most States this authority has not been exercised even in the case of financial aid. There are still a few cases of direct aid to private schools. In 1917 one hundred and sixty-eight academies in twenty-seven States were reported as obtaining \$441,463 from public appropriations and twenty-eight secondary schools for Negroes in the southern States shared in public money in amounts from \$50.00 to \$4,500.⁵ A number of States give indirect aid in the matter of textbooks and transportation.

Furthermore, it is within the individual State system of education that we find put into practice the principles upon which public education now rests and which are accepted by the majority of the people. These principles are three: 1) the so-called democratic principle, that education is the function of the States rather than of the family, and that the responsibility of providing the means of education rests primarily with the state. 2) the state has the right and the power to raise by taxation sufficient funds for adequate school support. 3) the interpretation of religious liberty and separation of Church and State as necessarily implying a purely secular or at least a "non-sectarian" religious education by the state.

These principles are firmly im-

bedded in the minds of most of the American people, so much so they are rapidly becoming traditional. They are thus formidable obstacles in the way of any successful attempt on the part of Catholics to secure any share of public state funds for their schools. Added to these obstacles is the fact that all but eight States have constitutional provisions prohibiting the use of public funds for religious schools. The educational philosophy of the States thus embodied in their Constitutions makes any sharing of public funds with religious schools a practical impossibility.

OUR ONLY HOPE FOR JUSTICE

All this points to the Federal government as our only hope for securing distributive justice. Our claims to share in the educational funds of the nation are far better founded upon the Federal Constitution than upon any State Constitution. It is true that, among the powers delegated to the Federal Government in the Constitution, there is no mention of the word "education." Furthermore, according to that illustrious document "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution . . . are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Specifically these provisions in our Constitution mean that the control and administration of education in the United States, according to our basic law, is reserved to the States and to the people.

⁵ Gabel, *op. cit.*, p. 752.

There are, however, no Federal constitutional provisions prohibiting the use of Federal money in the interests of private educational agencies. On the contrary, the Federal Constitution protects the inalienable right of the family and the Church in education. In several important decisions the Supreme Court has stated definitely that amongst the general rights guaranteed to the individual by the Constitution are to be listed the rights of the parent to direct and control the education of his children.

There are also other provisions of the Constitution which have an important bearing on the responsibility of the Federal government in the field of education. There is the general welfare clause: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the general welfare of the United States." This is the legal basis for innumerable actions now being developed by the Federal government in various areas which administratively belong wholly or in large part to the several States of the Union. There is the 16th amendment, adopted in 1913, which gives the Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes on incomes from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

It is no wonder the States are constantly demanding some portions of the tremendous sums which the Federal government now raises through

the income tax, be returned to them to carry on their functions, including education. In the past twenty years the States have been getting some of this money back in various ways, for instance, for roads, special types of education and auxiliary educational services. We have gone a long way towards more interstate activity and Federal assistance to the States. Under the general welfare clause the poor States which cannot provide adequate educational opportunities for their children can look for aid to the Federal government. Our hope, then, of receiving our just share of financial assistance is to be found in the Constitution of the United States and not in the separate States.

OUR EXPERIENCE IN THE PAST

In the matter of Federal control the general experience so far in all the varied and many activities of the Federal government has not been bad. The control following the appropriation and aid has not on the whole been undue. We have had some direct experience in this respect with the various school auxiliary services financed by the central government such as the N.Y.A., the lunch room program, and the nursery school program. Through all of these many Catholic schools have received direct financial aid from Federal funds. None of these Federal aid programs have led to any Federal control of the school. The only control has been

fiscal and the only supervision has been just enough to see that the objectives of the program have been carried out. As long as the schools receiving these funds used them honestly for the purpose for which they were given, as long as accurate reports were rendered, nothing whatever was done to interfere with their disbursement. The expenditure of the funds was left to the school authorities. In fact in each of these programs the local school authorities were given full freedom to conduct them and supervise them. The only thing demanded was accurate accounting both in regard to the money and the attainment of objectives.

Through these programs our Catholic citizens for the first time have received some return not only for the millions they have paid in taxes but also for the other millions they have donated to the general welfare by supporting their own schools. Our Catholic people do more for the general welfare of their country than any other group. During the past twenty years, for elementary education alone, they have donated nearly three billion dollars to our country for the education of its children. All this in addition to paying their full and just measure of public taxes for schools. And what have they received for it? Nothing, not even recognition or acknowledgment of this contribution. Now for the first time and from the Federal government,

our Catholic parents are beginning to get a tiny return for their taxes. And getting it without any sacrifice of principle or of independence.

SHOULD OUR CATHOLIC PARENTS BE CONSULTED?

In all this discussion of Federal aid we have not emphasized, to say the least, two important points. One is our Catholic parents who pay the bills. They should have some voice in this matter. They should be asked what they think of receiving financial help from the Federal government in conducting their schools. After all our basic principle is that education belongs to the family and the parents. Hence they should be consulted on this matter. It is true they look to their ecclesiastical leaders for guidance and they will follow willingly where that authority leads them. But should we stand in the way of lessening the burdens of our people in the support of education when those burdens can be lessened by public funds, without the sacrifice of principle or without grave danger to our schools?

The other point is that the public schools belong just as much to us as to our non-Catholic neighbors. This point we have overlooked too long. We have gone our own way and left the question of public education to those who make use of the public schools. As a result we have been, and are still in most sections

of the country, completely ignored. We have money invested in the public schools as other citizens have. We should help to see that this money is spent properly.

One result of our neglect of public education is that the public schools in many sections of our land, particularly in the rural sections and small towns, are considered Protestant schools. They have become, in fact, in many instances sectarian.

But the point is, if there is any good to be obtained for the public schools in the poor sections of the country by Federal aid, should we oppose it simply on the grounds that we are not to share in it? Should we adopt this dog-in-the-manger attitude? Of late we have been put in the unenviable position of being the only organized group opposing Federal aid for education. We have been honest and sincere in our American opposition but our motives have been largely misconstrued. The question is becoming more and more vital. Another bill is ready for Congress. It will come up again and again and eventually there will be some Federal aid to education. Are we going to continue as opponents or are we going to modify our attitude? That is one of the most important questions we have to face and answer in the very near future.

The purpose of this article is to reopen the whole question of Federal

aid to education and to stimulate study and discussion of this important problem in the light of recent developments. The approach has been from the viewpoint of philosophy. Negatively I have tried to show the lack of any fundamental philosophical or moral principle on which we could base opposition to Federal aid to education. On the positive side I have endeavored to adduce sound philosophical arguments why we Catholics should ask for, and receive, such aid. Certain factors, I believe, have entered the situation which provide sufficient reason for further study and reconsideration of our traditional stand.

These factors are: 1) the general and national opposition to Federal control of the schools has been strengthened by the experience of schools abroad in totalitarian countries and by our war against totalitarianism. 2) The obvious need for equalizing educational opportunity has been emphasized by the war and was recently voiced by the President. 3) Our experience so far with Federal aid in auxiliary school services is lessening the fear of central control and is letting us realize the great good resulting from these services. 4) As an equally obvious fact we Catholics can expect no help from the several States. In the light of these principles and factors, assuredly no harm can come from a reconsideration of our position.

Free Speech

Free speech, like free books, free press, free assembly, should be used wisely, not wastefully. It should not serve to promote discord, injustice, falsehood. It is our defence against political or business corruption, and the tyranny of majorities. It is also a legitimate means through which to oppose the intrigues of highly financed minorities. It can be exercised to maintain liberties, not bestowed upon people as party grants but as constitutional rights. No man, however, should be conceded free speech to work unlawful injury to his fellow man, to limit the exercise of peaceful, helpful religious beliefs, to undermine constitutional government. Sometimes it is projected in such wholesale output for ignoble and destructive objectives, its fine essence is changed into a soiled, ugly substitute. Those who clamor so insistently for all-out free speech should remember that freedom is governed by responsibility. Free speech should never degenerate into free screech.—SOUTHERN CROSS, *Buenos Aires, March 30, 1945.*



Montreal to Addis Ababa

The French-Canadian Province of the Society of Jesus has been entrusted by the Pope with the organization of education in Ethiopia at the special request of Emperor Haile Selassie. Ethiopia was one of the first missions entrusted to the Jesuits in the sixteenth century. A teacher's college is to be opened in Addis Ababa where teachers will be trained first for primary schools. Later high school and professional education is to be organized. The first priests are to leave Montreal soon. The first Jesuits arrived in Ethiopia in 1555. They were persecuted for 50 years but finally the Emperor and thousands of the people were won over to Catholicism. In 1632, all the Jesuits were put to death and the missions ended.—*From JESUIT MISSIONS, New York, N. Y., June, 1945.*

Some Statistics on Large Families

MARQUETTE LONG

Reprinted from MOUNT MARY QUARTERLY*

“**L**ARGE families are absurd” is a remark we hear so frequently. As an offset against the numerous theories, the accompanying table may prove interesting. It was taken from a list of fifty famous men and women, and the names are not “hand-picked,” but were discovered during a brief period of research. A student with a knack for statistics, if set at work in a vast library, could produce a far more extensive and illuminating tabulation. The figure in the first column indicates the number of children in the family, and in the second column the number indicates the rank of the distinguished child. Of these distinguished personages, twenty-three percent came from families of ten or more children, and forty-one percent from families of seven or more children. The fifty families average more than nine, and the fourth child or later is the “child of grace.”

One who reads over these names and considers their contribution to civilization will realize that life would not be quite so comfortable as it is had the parents of these inventors, musicians, politicians, patriots, frontiersmen, and great women thought large families “absurd.”

S. T. Coleridge.....	10	10
Franklin.....	10	8
Haydn.....	12	2
Washington Irving.....	11	11
Thomas Jefferson.....	10	3
St. Ignatius Loyola.....	13	13
James Madison.....	12	1
Father Matthew.....	12	6
Napoleon.....	10	4
Lord Nelson.....	11	6
Israel Putnam.....	12	11
Sir Joshua Reynolds.....	11	7
St. Francis de Sales.....	13	1
Tennysón.....	12	4
Cardinal Vaughan.....	13	1
Frederic Ozanam.....	14	4

* Mount Mary College, Milwaukee, Wis., Winter, 1945

Some "modern" individualists would not consider a large family a suitable environment for Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, or James Madison, the Father of the American Constitution. But the former was the third of ten children and the latter, Madison, had eleven sisters and brothers. Valiant Washington, the first President of our great Democracy, was the eldest of six. Nancy Hanks whose destiny was to give us Lincoln, was the youngest of eight children. Washington Irving, the first who replied to the sneer, "Who reads an American book?" was the last of eleven children, and Dickens, the most popular novelist of the nineteenth century, was the second of eight. The great apostle of the Indies, a Jesuit missionary, Saint Francis Xavier, was the last of six children. The fourth of seven was the eminent churchman and patriot, Archbishop Carroll; while Cardinal Gibbons was the fourth of six. Then, too, Cardinal Newman, the well known English convert, Churchman, and writer was the first born of six. Our American patriot, Nathan Hale, was the sixth child in the line of twelve, and John Marshall, "who first clothed the Supreme Court with supreme authority," had fourteen sisters and brothers, and General Pershing, eleven. Jefferson Davis on whose tomb the South has inscribed, "American statesman and defender of the Constitution," was the last of ten children. The foundress of the Religious of the Sacred Heart in this country was Mother Hardy, who had eight sisters and brothers, herself the fourth in line. Another early American pioneer was Father Marquette, the discoverer of the Mississippi River, and the first of six children. Explorer and frontiersman, Daniel Boone, "who opened the gateway to the West" and the fiery John Paul Jones, were respectively the sixth of nine and the fifth of seven. If the Arkwright and Wedgwood families had stopped with twelve children, they would never have given the world the inventive genius of Richard Arkwright, the Englishman who invented the first spinningmill worked by waterpower, or the exquisite artistry of Josiah Wedgwood, for each was the thirteenth child in his respective family. Had the Scott family stopped with eight children, Sir Walter would never have stocked our libraries with his moving novels, for he was the ninth child. The Bach family could have withheld a "wealth of loveliness" from the world had they refused the eighth child, Johann Sebastian Bach. "The family which wants only two or three children may rob the world of a possible genius, if the germs of genius are flowing down its ancestral stream."

One of the most striking of the thirty-three Europeans on the list is Saint Catherine of Siena, who was the last of twenty-five children. Along with her we may associate Saint Ignatius, the founder of the Society of Jesus, and the youngest of thirteen children. Edward VII, King of England, called "Edward the Peacemaker," was a powerful factor in the preservation of peace in Europe. He was one of Queen Victoria's nine children. Beethoven, the German composer whose sonatas, overtures, and chamber music all reach the highest levels of musical imagination, had eleven sisters and brothers. Vincent McNabb, author of "Eleven, Thank God" was one of the eleven for whom his mother thanked God so heartily. Tennyson, one of the most famous literary men of his century was the second eldest of twelve. Sister Therèse, better known to us as the Little Flower, "bloomed for only a few years, and dying taught with singular persuasion throughout the world the lesson the world so sorely needs, trust in God and His loving Providence." The ninth of nine children, she is a splendid example of the "absurdity" of large families.



Greed

One of the difficulties, as I see it, is that we worship money instead of honor. A billionaire, in our estimation, is much greater in these days in the eyes of the people than the public servant who works for public interest. It makes no difference if the billionaire rode to wealth on the sweat of little children and the blood of underpaid labor. No one ever considered Carnegie libraries steeped in the blood of the Homestead steelworkers, but they are. We do not remember that the Rockefeller Foundation is founded on the dead miners of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company and a dozen other similar performances. We worship Mammon; and until we go back to ancient fundamentals and return to the Giver of the Tables of the Law and His teachings, these conditions are going to remain with us.—*Harry S. Truman, in 1937.*

This Is America

*Reprinted from THE CLEVELAND CITIZEN**

THESE things are happening in America:

MONTGOMERY, Ala.—Two anti-poll tax bills met sudden death in the Alabama house as legislators cried that repeal of the undemocratic voting requirements would "endanger white supremacy in Alabama."

EUGENE, Ore.—Police are seeking hoodlums who desecrated the Jewish synagogue on the campus of the University of Oregon. Nazi insignia were scratched on the walls and over the honor roll. The flag staff was broken and the eagle at the top was knocked from its place. Altar cloths were torn and the building was defiled in other ways.

CLEVELAND, Ohio—A veteran of the war in Europe declares that he hates all Germans.

TRENTON, N. J.—A blazing six-foot cross was burned on the site of a proposed Negro housing project here. The cross was placed on the spot selected for the first of 250 buildings to be built for the housing project.

UHRICHSVILLE, Ohio—On V-E Day a mob shattered the windows of the store of Sam Goodman, a Jewish merchant, stole his merchandise, painted his automobile yellow and turned it on its back. The chief of police and the mayor watched the demonstration. Goodman had been deferred by his selective service board. After a petition signed by local people had been sent to his draft board, he was finally inducted. Six weeks later he was discharged for medical reasons. After the mob attack, Goodman left town and the store is now being run by his aged father.

SPRINGFIELD, Ill.—The Illinois senate judiciary committee virtually killed a senate bill providing for a state FEPC by voting to refer it to a subcommittee. The bill would prohibit job discrimination for race, color, creed or national origin.

CLEVELAND, Ohio—A veteran of the war in the Pacific declares that he can "smell a Jap a hundred yards away."

CHICAGO, Ill.—Identified before a state senate committee as the anonymous source of anti-Jewish literature sent to all members of the Illinois General Assembly, Ainslee E. Horney admitted he conferred with an official of the Illinois Manufacturers Association before sending out his tracts.

SAN FRANCISCO, Calif.—"Outside influences with large property holdings in the area" are blamed by the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union for an incident in which 300 warehousemen in Stockton refused to work with three returned Japanese Americans, who had to be removed on threat of a walkout.

It all starts in grammar school. We were taught and our children are taught mainly the fundamental differences between people, never the

* 209-221 Chester—12 Building, Cleveland, Ohio, June 1, 1945

obvious similarities. Chinese children eat with chopsticks. Negroes have wide, flat noses and come from the heart of Africa where there are cannibals. Jews all have hooked noses.

Among the first words we learn are "nigger," "wop," "kike," "kraut," "hunky," "polak," "dago," "sheeny," "guinea," "bohunk," "hun," "shanty Irish," "red," "slant-eye," "frog" and others in the same vein. We are evidently taught these things because they make us feel superior, better than someone else.

We all know that we must have started in some place other than America. We all have one or several of the above races in our lineage. Can you prove you aren't part Jew? Can you prove you aren't part Negro? Can you prove you aren't part "slant-eye"? Even the Indians came from Russia or one of the other Asiatic countries. Racially, you couldn't give the country back to them.

So the churches preach "tolerance." Tolerance means condescension. They don't preach what Christ said. Christ said "Love thy neighbor as thyself." Christ said "You are your brother's keeper." The churches are kidding themselves.

"Tolerance" as a word should be stricken out of the dictionary. Someone should pass a law against it.

It isn't a question of "tolerance." It's a question of love. Until you're willing to accept love as the answer to the issue, you're wasting your time. Forming committees against race hatred may make for a lot of beautiful conversation. It may even help a little in some instances.

But the only honest answer is the kind of love Christ was talking about.



Just a Stooge

One of the delegates to the United Nations Conference was being heckled by one man during an interview about the Polish question. The delegate finally turned to the heckler and asked: "Are you from Tass?" . . . The heckler insisted that he had no connection with the Soviet's news agency, and said, "I speak for the Lublin government" . . . "Oh, I see," the delegate dismissed him. "Demi-Tass."—*Leonard Lyons in the New York Post.*

THE EDITORIAL MIND

Rash Judgments

WHEN Pius XI made the Lateran Treaty with Mussolini, when Pius XII gave his blessing to German soldiers visiting the Vatican and received an ambassador from Japan, they *could* have done these things because "the Vatican is the natural advocate of Fascism"; and a certain section of the American press puts that very interpretation upon the Papal acts. Catholics are weary of pointing out that there were other and very good reasons for these acts, wholly unconnected with any love of Fascism; and of pointing to the Papal record of opposition to Fascism.

The fact remains, however, that *if* the Pope were fascist-minded, that is the kind of thing he would do. Whence, by a very easy—but quite fallacious—bit of reasoning, it is concluded that because he did these things, therefore he is fascist-minded.

If I know that Jones is a drunkard, I have at once the explanation of his red nose; but I cannot say that because a man's nose is red he is therefore a drunkard.

That simple fallacy is the curse of race relations. Even Catholics, who,

of all people, should be able to recognize it at sight, fall into it. Unconsciously they absorb the racial mythology about the laziness, untrustworthiness, lawlessness, dirtiness, dishonesty of Negroes. They happen to pass through Harlem. They read the newspapers, where every Negro delinquency is spotted for them. (Have you ever read a newspaper item to the effect that "John Smith, a *white* banker, was sentenced for embezzlement?") They see Negroes almost entirely in menial—and therefore often dirty—occupations. They rarely, if ever, meet a cultured Negro—largely because they are not interested in meeting Negroes at all.

There are dozens of reasons for dirt, dishonesty and lawlessness. Slum dwellers in Dublin and London show the same characteristics as dwellers in slum areas in Harlem. Juvenile delinquency, drunkenness, street brawls are the earmarks of slums everywhere. Depressed classes, especially those forcibly depressed, tend to violent reaction. The "haves" are quite content with the *status quo* — why shouldn't they be?—and are not disposed to change it; the "have-nots" stand it for just so long, and then there is an explosion. Cause and

effect are the same the world over.

Unfortunately—like our friends who start from the assumption that the Pope is a Fascist and “prove” it by pointing to the Lateran Treaty and the Japanese ambassador—too many Catholics start by assuming certain characteristics to be Negro traits, and “prove” their assumption, from their own casual observations of members of the race.

A little exercise in proper reasoning would help to remedy this. So would a little reflection on the Eighth Commandment, with its prohibition against rash judgments.—*The INTER-RACIAL REVIEW, New York, N. Y., May, 1945.*

The Church and a New Germany

PUBLICISTS in this and other countries have been busy for months in drawing up “blue prints” for a new, peaceful Germany, which is vital to a better order in Europe. Scientists, too, are discussing the question. Psychoanalysts have concluded that Germany was afflicted with “psychocultural aggressiveness.” These are high-sounding words which mean greed or “might is right,” a neopagan theory.

There is a simple, time-tried remedy for this false philosophy. It is found in the teachings of our Divine Saviour in His precepts of justice and charity to all men based on belief in God.

His gospel tamed and civilized the wildest of tribes ranging from the barbarians who overthrew the Roman Empire to the headhunters of darkest Africa in later times.

The Saviour's precepts have been taught and exemplified even in Germany all through the reign of savage Hitlerism. Incomplete reports from Catholic sources indicate that hundreds of priests and numerous lay leaders, as well as some Protestants, died in Nazi prisons for those teachings. Other thousands languished in concentration camps.

The German Catholic bishops, priests and lay leaders, at the risk of their lives, fought Nazism from the very beginning. If our publicists and scientists want to do something practical, they can present some blue prints based on the considered opinions of these men who can rightly claim an intimate knowledge of the German mind and of Germany's problems. They know their people's qualities and weaknesses. They stood by them in the days of catastrophe. They did not run away but suffered persecution for championing human liberty and Christian civilization.

Reports indicate that a large percentage of the nearly thirty million Catholics stood by their Bishops in spite of Himmler and the Gestapo. They and believing Protestants are a strong minority of many millions offering a beginning for the rebuilding of Germany as a peace-loving nation.

It is not, in fact, too much to say that unless German life is rebuilt on the strong foundation of traditional Christianity, there will be no lasting settlement of the European problem. The hope of future peace cannot be separated from the millions of German citizens who never bartered their Faith for the pagan promises of Hitler. If the victorious Allies are really interested in democracy, it is to these people and their leaders that they must turn. — *The MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, Detroit, Mich., May 17, 1945.*

A. C. T. U.

STEPS have been taken towards the formation of a chapter of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists in San Diego.

As management lays off thousands of workers in the cutbacks, cancellations and terminations of contracts, workers should have reasonable protection, information and association. Our red, pink and "blushes" competitors have a lot of plans to make mischief and brew their own type of trouble in the unions and among workers.

Catholics have a sound, solid and constructive program and policy to get labor its just, honest rights, to keep down the cost of living, create employment and spread wealth and money around.

Most Catholics aren't aware that

the Church has a practical, detailed program and definite teachings in the matter of economic and social relations and duties. Many of them are too complacent, narrow-visioned or uninterested to learn, discuss and apply the principles and teaching of the Encyclicals to their own problems.

For instance, white collar and office workers have lagged way behind in the advance of wages during the war effort. *Time Magazine* for November 22, 1944, told a sordid story of the selfish, unjust and illegal efforts of the greatest bank on the West Coast to prevent its workers using a right guaranteed them by Federal law — to bargain collectively and form themselves into unions. The first minimum wage law passed by any State in the Union was framed, lobbied and put over by a priest who is now a Bishop and a woman lawyer who is now a nun.

That kind of intelligent, cooperative effort is needed badly in San Diego and the diocese. The formation of a chapter of the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists widely spread elsewhere would provide the basis of good unionism.

Prosperity and economic peace and good wages don't just happen. They happen because people with vision, by prayer and by long, hard, cooperative work move God to bless them and make them happen. — *SOUTHERN CROSS, San Diego, Calif., May 18, 1945.*

Morals and Crime

MR. HOOVER declared recently that juvenile delinquency is evidently due in the first place to lack of any sense of moral values. Ranking first among the delinquency counts is prostitution of teen-age girls. Other charges against girls include in the order of their frequency: indecent behavior, drunkenness, driving while drunk, armed robbery and theft. Significantly, Mr. Hoover holds that the main factor involved in juvenile delinquency is the lack of home training: "The school and church cannot simply be substituted for the home," he asserted. "In other words, the good influence of the home is very often lacking. I have frequently pointed out that what we call juvenile delinquency should be called with greater accuracy adult delinquency, because the first responsibility rests with the adults. It can be seen across the whole country that the children lack proper discipline. Our schools and churches cannot adequately supply this lack." Or, to say it another way, they cannot completely repair the damage the parental home has wrought by its sins of omission and commission, its failure to do its job.

Similar views were expressed by James Bennett, head of the Federal

penal institutions, who asserted that most of the young male criminals come from homes broken by the death or divorce of parents, or because outside employment kept either the father or mother away from the home for long periods of time. Questioned why some of the youthful criminals came from "the better families," Bennett asserted categorically that "lack of proper discipline" in such families was usually at fault, and pointed out that in very many cases one or the other parent had "protected" the child. "In my opinion," Bennett declared, "our inquiry has shown that the mother who spoils her children represents even a greater danger to the children than does the mother who neglects them. It is difficult to choose between the two."

Here, then, is the crux of the problem of juvenile delinquency and it is clear that unless measures are adopted to reestablish and fortify the integrity of the home and family all other efforts to correct the problem of juvenile delinquency will be only palliatives that may ultimately do more harm than good because they will merely serve to lull the public into apathy, until the problem of juvenile delinquency becomes so great as to endanger the very fibre of our national existence.—*The WANDERER, St. Paul, Minn., April 5, 1945.*

Our Separated Brethren

BERNARD GRIMLEY

*Reprinted from The MONTH**

THE key success of the Reformation, we have Mr. Belloc's word for it, was its success in capturing the Throne of England. By that fact the Reformation secured a safe asylum for the Reformers who were ejected from other countries of Europe during the initial stages of the assault on Christendom, and with it all the prestige that went with Royal power in those days, and all the protection necessary for further attempts to uproot Christendom from its Rock-foundation, the Papacy.

We have the same historian's assurance that history cannot account for the success of the Reformation in England. No single factor, no combination of factors, which a historian might legitimately adduce as the causes of the Reformation's success here, but was operating more strongly in those countries of Europe where the Reformation failed. Yet it succeeded in England, and from the unpopularity and childlessness of Mary the Catholic to the unpopularity of the last Catholic monarch whom the Whigs ejected in 1688, largely because of his plea for toleration of religious disunity, there is an unexplainable run of luck against the Old Religion all the time.

Why should Mary have been so unpopular, and Elizabeth so popular? Why should Mary's reign have been short, and Elizabeth's a long run of success in the crucial years for Christendom? Why was Mary's reign unspectacular and Elizabeth's full of glory? Why were the Stuarts such a tragedy? Why did the Young Pretender fail after getting so far as Derby? Every time the hopes of the faithful followers of the Old Religion were raised, they were in the event dashed again, and they themselves sunk into deeper dejection. There is probably nothing so sad to read as the history of the Reformation and post-Reformation in England. When the professional historian confesses inability to explain a thing, how shall the person with no pretensions to the craft dare to speak, unless it be of Providence, which foresaw in detail the rise of this country to earthly greatness, and the spread of its language over the surface of the earth to such an extent that, if the curse of Babel has ever been near to a temporary break, it is now, when so much of the world still speaks and understands one English tongue? Surely English is to be the language of the return of the world to Christendom?

* 114 Mount Street, London, W. 1, July-August, 1944

Is it rash to suggest that grace was withdrawn from England, and that she was chosen to bear the punishment which was due to so large a part of Europe for the sins and scandals which preceded, and were partly the cause of the Reformation? Intellectually Protestantism does not rank very high as a heresy. It does not compare with Arianism for intellectual subtlety, or with Gnosticism, but its social hold for nearly four hundred years means that the Church will not easily forget the price she had to pay for the scandals of the Renaissance. England, Protestant England, with its immediate influence on Northern Europe, and its later influence in America and the British Empire, was the rod which God had in pickle for the Church's back, and the English language, which ultimately may decay, as Latin did into a variety of Romantic languages, is still an instrument of anti-Catholic influence.

Whether it is the explanation, or even part of it, one does not dare to say confidently, but it is an explanation, and one which opens up many interesting lines of thought and speculation, but particularly interesting is one, the Pentecostal character of the rescue of the Catholics in England in their darkest hours, not only by the generous and forgiving Irish, but by Italians like St. Paul of the Cross, who had never seen England but pitied and loved her, by the French *émigré* priests who came here during

the Terror, and many of them stayed till death, by Belgians who founded their own seminary to prepare for the English "Mission," by Rosmini who sent Gentili to us, by the Dutch priests who used to come in great numbers, and so on.

A NATIONAL RETURN TO THE FAITH

The seminaries were in Rome, in France, in Flanders, in Portugal, in Spain. A Spanish Bishop Yepes collected memoirs of our martyrs, a Spanish woman, Dona Maria de Carvajal y Mendoza (is her life still available in the Quarterly Series?), came to see for herself the sufferings of the Catholics. The embassies of so many of the Powers gave us safe chapels. It does seem as if the Church in Europe had some glimmer of appreciation of the idea that English Catholics were bearing the iniquity of all, and filling up in their bodies the things that had so long been wanting of the Passion of Christ in the Church of Europe.

God will never abandon His Church, but He has not promised never to abandon any part of it, especially for the benefit of the whole Body, and ultimately, as we must feel, even for the benefit of the part which is punished. It is a curious fact that there is probably no country whose return to the Faith would be so welcome to the Catholics of Europe as England, and it is not due to the behavior of English travelers and tourists. Of

that we may be well sure as we read the memoirs of their travels, and as one witnessed some of them, God pardon them, only yesterday. It can only be a memory of a long distant past, or a vague realization of some mystic truth such as the one suggested. It is a most encouraging fact, as Archbishop Goodier loved to point out, that only in England is there a profound general conviction, which no persecution has ever stamped out, that there will some day be a national return to the Faith, and only England prays for that day so constantly and confidently.

The same confidence was in our martyrs, whether prophesying the Convent to be set up at Tyburn, or praying "Jesus convert England, Jesus have mercy on this country." It is in all our people today, in a confused sort of dream, or inspired consciousness, that the Return will somehow be the work of Mary in Heaven, and of the Pope on earth, and will be sealed by the Mass in the ancient shrines. A Bishop long deceased told me that he would as readily say Mass with Martin Luther's chalice as in any of the pre-Reformation churches of England. In that he was certainly out of tune with the sentiment of the Faithful in this country. He was Irish, and some Irish feel that it is a duty to prevent us getting easy with error, and with Protestant error in particular, by our being unguardedly kind to Protestants. Personally

one welcomes the corrective, whilst recognizing that the issue does not present itself in Ireland at anything like the angle which it makes here. We must always recognize that, when fidelity to the Church and her teaching is the point, the Irish have a proud right to be considered.

Compromise was ruled out in Ireland, under God's grace, and the issue was fought out simply, with all the help that persecution coming from alien hands naturally brings to resistance, though we should not, it seems, exaggerate Irish consciousness of being alien to the English in the early days of the struggle, when their loyalty to the Faith alone saved them. Ireland's awareness of her separation in race from us was not then what it is today, or was even in the days of O'Connell, the Liberator. All glory to her, then, for her Faith. At the same time, it must always be remembered that here the success of the Reformation was due to a native brand of Reformed religion being presented by their own Government to the people, a brand which was essentially a compromise between the Old Faith and the extreme forms of the Continental Reforming movement. The formularies would stand a twofold interpretation, admittedly with strain at times, and that was deliberately intended, so as to satisfy the Extremists whilst not unduly alarming Catholics.

The conservative movement of the Laudian and Caroline divines was

only feasible because the English Reformation had been a compromise. Its success was possible for the same reason, and to this day the Church of England is more Lutheran in temper than Calvinist. Especially is this so with regard to the Blessed Sacrament, where the extremely illogical concept of Companation more accurately represents the average compromised mind of Anglicanism than later and more ruthlessly adverse theories than Luther's. This is not to deny the tremendous influence of Calvinism on Anglicanism. It certainly rocked the boat and shifted the cargo, but the boat continued to sail under compromise. It does still, and it is the height of political sagacity that the higher offices of the State Church are reserved for men who show that peculiarly post-Reform English temperament of patience with the practical difficulties of religious compromise.

The official English mind is persistently realist, and therefore necessarily opportunist in practice, with consistency of guiding principle and major aim. The Italians talk much about patience. The English official mind practices it in silence, and resents impatience and intolerance above all things. That is why the English tradition among Catholics of this country is surer in touch than the Irish tradition, in all that concerns the practical approach to our non-Catholics, though possibly it is not always so crystal clear as is the Irish tradition on the

opposition of the principles, as principles which separate the Catholic from the Protestant thing. Speculatively the Irish are surer, practically the English, and that is why we, the Anglo-Irish Catholics, for that is what we are as a body, whatever preference individuals may have, should thank God for the thorough racial mixture that we are.

STILL REMAIN OUR BRETHREN

When Mr. Butler, or any other President of the Board of Education, has sincerely convinced himself that he can do no more, as a practical politician, for our schools than a determined measure, he will, if that measure does not satisfy us Catholics, proceed to enact what might mean our extinction as educators with a suavity and politeness which infuriates the Irish more than open persecution would, but which the English understand, if they do not approve. If we protest loudly we shall be called ungentlemanly disturbers of the family harmony, but one feels gratefully confident that "the Irish in us" will not allow us to be silent. Perhaps the racial mixture will work the necessary trick, as neither element alone would. Nevertheless in the urgently necessary approach to our separated brethren, the Protestant and post-Protestant English, one who cannot prove that he has even a saving trace of Irish blood (perhaps that is the nicest way to put it), feels that the

English way is imperative. We shall not succeed without friendliness, kindness, tolerance, and that pity which is the love of compensation without a suspicion of hatred due to past wrongs.

Thank God that the Reformers left Baptism alone. The Anabaptists did not come early enough to do the harm which might have been done, nor did they succeed too well. Were they too rigid for the compromising mind? The fact that Baptism is still validly administered to thousands of English children yearly means that so many are incorporated into the True Church. Do we always sufficiently remember that there is only one Baptism, which effects what Christ intends, the supernatural life in its fulness, with the theological and moral virtues infused with sanctifying grace, membership of the True Church, acquired rights to the Kingdom in Heaven, and so on? The majority of the English are still Catholics till they are seven years of age, then. They are in literally exact terms our brethren, and they are not yet separated brethren either.

They become separated from us when, on attaining the use of reason, they do not profess the Roman Catholic Faith, the Faith of their Baptism; but they still remain our brethren. They are not "outside the Church" in the sense of the dogmatic dictum that "outside the Church there is no salvation," because first of all it is extremely doubtful in the vast

majority of cases if their rejection of the Church is ever a conscious act, or anything more than an unconsciously affected segregation from the Church's influence by life as it is in England. Remember the slowness with which a genius of the first order like Newman opened his eyes to the truth. Father Vernon Johnson tells us that the Catholic Church was simply not a factor in his religious consciousness till after he had reached manhood. How could an intelligent man miss so immense a thing as the Church of the Four Marks? But he did.

Certainly their rejection of the Church is not now "informed" and "deliberate," as it was with the early Reformers, and as it would need to be to put them "outside the Church." It is not informed, because it is not the rejection of the Church "as it is and for what it is," the one ark of salvation for all mankind. Did anyone ever hear a Protestant refuse to be a Catholic for that reason? It is not a deliberate defiance of Christ either, for they profess the most ardent desire to serve Him. Nor is it usually a deliberate or conscious refusal to be Catholics. In plain truth they remain outside the Church under a variety of amazing misapprehensions as to its true character. They are not informed, and that is the measure of our apostolate to them. They do not really reject the Church, but fail to see it, in many cases through what is technically called "invincible ignor-

ance," but let us be careful to explain that this is a technical name for such an intellectual and moral inability to see the Church "as in fact it is," as makes their non-professing membership of it without blame. It does not mean that they are ignorant people.

BELONG TO SOUL OF THE CHURCH

If there is any error in calling our separated brethren "non-professing members" of the Church I hasten to withdraw the term, but it does seem to describe the position of those who were baptized into the Church and who have been unconsciously segregated, in the overwhelming majority of cases at least, from its teaching and influence. Formally they are neither schismatical nor heretical as individuals, though they are the victims of both heresy and schism. In most cases the baptismal life of grace was not interrupted by their failure to profess the Catholic Faith, and if they have preserved their baptismal innocence, or duly repented of sin committed after baptism, they belong to the soul of the Church. Of the body of the Church they are members invisibly, if one may borrow from Archbishop d'Herbigny.

We need not fear that to admit the co-existence in certain places of a host of non-professing members alongside the Body of the Church, affects adversely, in any but a local and individual way, the essential visibility of the Body of the Church, which is an

article of faith as well as an essential characteristic. The visibility of the Church as the Catholic Thing is to be assessed primarily on a world view. God will not let the Church become less than the Catholic Church in the eyes of the world. *Securus judicat orbis terrarum*. The judgment of the world is safe, and the world will always readily know and proclaim that the Catholic and Roman Church is the original and genuine Church of Christ. Individuals like Fr. Johnson may find the fog which a host of non-professing Catholics creates, obscuring the visibility of the Church in a given locality, but that does not affect her essential visibility. Even here most people know the Catholic Church for its catholicity, and recognize it as the same thing as the Italian or Spanish Faith, and the same thing which they found wherever in the world they traveled

So if "the Irish in us" rightly reminds us that they are separated, let "the English in us" remind us that they are our brethren by Baptism, that on a false and illogical basis they hold many of the truths of the Catholic Church, that in short we have some things in common as well as the things which divide us. The testing may lie ahead of us in a nearer future than we visualize, and we hope to be edified by the fidelity of some of them in the crucial hour, even if upon us, as the cornerstone, falls the weight of the trouble. For things are changing, and

the Reformation must have worked itself to a predestined conclusion, when the champion of the country which so far has sponsored the Reformation, Mr. Churchill, commits this country to the Destruction of Prussian mili-

tarism as well as Nazi tyranny. We have traveled far since Carlyle, and his praise of Frederick, so wrongly called "the Great." The dawn may be due to break, and it may be a red dawn, but God is with us.



Russia and the Poles

No one has oppressed the Poles as much as have the Russian people. The Russian people have served in the hands of the Tsar as the executioner of Polish Freedom.

Why should we (and) Great Britain, who have been oppressing a greater number of nations than any other people, why should we repudiate the right of separation for Poland, the Ukraine, Finland?

If Finland, if Poland, if the Ukraine break away from Russia, it is nothing terrible. Wherein is it bad? Anyone who says so is a Chauvinist. One must be insane to continue the policy of the Tsar Nicholas. . . . Once upon a time Alexander and Napoleon traded peoples, once upon a time the Tsars were trading portions of Poland. Are we to continue this policy of the Tsars? That would be repudiation of international tactics, that would be Chauvinism of the worst brand.

We say that boundaries are determined by the will of the population. . . . The proletariat must not resort to force, for it must not interfere with the freedom of peoples. No people can be free that oppresses another.—*Lenin. Reprinted from The RECORD, Perth, Australia, March 21, 1945.*

Child Labor and School Attendance

FAMILY and child life have endured many severe strains during the war. The call of the service and of war industries deprived millions of families of their natural leaders. Many mothers have had to assume a dual role in the home. In addition, large numbers of them have wanted to do their part by entering into war work or by taking jobs that have been vacated by men called to the services or to war industry. As a result, these war dislocations have left millions of children and young people with the merest shreds of home life. Children and young people in large numbers have also heeded the call of war industry. They have felt that they too should contribute their share to the war effort. There has been a great exodus of young people between sixteen and seventeen from school into war industries and general commercial occupations. There has also been a considerable employment of boys and girls between fourteen and fifteen.

Both State and Federal governments have relaxed child-labor standards in order to meet the war emergency. Not only have we had a relaxing of child labor standards, we have also had a very general breakdown in the enforcement of existing standards.

As leaders, we may not take a pessimistic view of the influence of

This statement was issued by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John O'Grady, Executive Secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, Director, Social Action Department, N.C.W.C.; V. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt, Director, Department of Education, N.C.W.C., and the Rev. Paul F. Tanner, Director, Youth Department, N.C.W.C. It was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Hon. Donald L. O'Toole, of New York, March 22, 1945.

war on family and child life. We feel confident that the sufferings and tragedies of the war will bring a new awakening of religious faith; that is, will bring man closer to his fellow man and to his God. We feel sure that it will bring the Church closer to the lives of the people. We are aware also that the problems growing out of the war offer a new challenge to all our religious leaders, a challenge to develop a heroism that has been so characteristic of religious life in days of great emergency. It will also be a challenge to us to present practical programs for action which will make our people more conscious not only of their religious but also of their civic responsibilities.

In dealing with young boys and girls in our grade schools and high schools we should be conscious of the change that has come over their lives.

They have developed a new sense of their own independence and importance. The new attitude of youth presents real problems for our educators. We must think more and more of ways and means of making the liberal arts a part not only of high school but also of grammar-school education. Too much of our discussion in regard to ways and means of making the school more challenging is centered around vocational education. However important or even necessary may be a certain amount of training in specialized vocations, it can never provide the foundation for a genuine democratic society; it can never prepare people to resist the shibboleths that make for a totalitarian order.

Every effort must be made to detain within the educational system students in our grade schools and high schools at the present time. Army and Navy officials have pointed out that those who are about to enter the services should as far as possible complete their high-school curriculum. This should be our attitude in regard to the students in our schools. We must contribute our part to making the present child labor and educational standards as effective as possible. This calls for a strict enforcement of child labor and school attendance laws. During the war many schools have come to take an easy-going attitude toward lack of school attendance. Children are thus greatly encouraged in habits of law-breaking.

One of the most important postwar problems will be that of inducing young people whose education was interrupted by the war to return to school. Many of these young men and women will have become accustomed to high wage standards and lavish spending. The schools must have a program that challenges the interest and imagination of these young people and it cannot be a merely vocational program.

A considerable number of young people who have gone to work prematurely during the war will want to continue in gainful employment and, while they may succeed to a degree, their lot will by no means be easy. Competition for jobs after the war is going to be intense. Discharged servicemen will have preference on every front and this is bound to make it more difficult for the succeeding generation.

POSTWAR EMPLOYMENT

Now is the time to prepare our program of postwar employment for children and young people. We must write into the statute books of the various States high standards of child labor and compulsory school attendance. The laws that we now write need not be put into effect until after the war, but we should be ready for after-war problems. We should have our legislation on the statute books and we should also have adequate provision for its enforcement. We

should insist on having in our State laws a sixteen-year minimum age for all employment during school hours and for employment in manufacturing, mechanical and processing establishments at any time. For all other employment State laws should require a fourteen-year minimum age for employment outside of school hours. Children under sixteen should not be employed between 10 P. M. and 7 A. M. All State child-labor laws should require a maximum 8-hour day for combined school and work; they should also require a maximum 8-hour day, 40-hour week, with a 6-day week for all minors under eighteen.

One of the most serious child-labor problems in the United States is the employment of children of families engaged in large commercial agriculture. In some areas these families are constantly on the move. Even in places where they remain for a considerable period of time school facilities are inadequate. A number of the camps operated by the Office of Labor, War Food Administration, Department of Agriculture, have school facilities for the children of migratory workers. There is a great need for the extension of such educational facilities.

It is most important that there should be adequate State legislation covering the employment of children of migratory workers. Large numbers of very young children are now

employed in harvesting and processing various types of agricultural products. There is no reason why these children should not be included in State laws. They are vastly different from the children who work with their own fathers on one-family farms and on land owned or leased by their own families. There is no reason, moreover, why people operating large commercial farms should be exempt from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. They are engaged in the harvesting and processing of goods that enter into interstate commerce. They can no longer be placed in the category of ordinary farmers. They are really large commercial operators, and should be subject to the same legislation as the ordinary industrial enterprises.

Law alone cannot give us high standards of child labor or compulsory school attendance. Without proper understanding and vigilance on the part of the people our legislative standards will never be enforced. Child labor and compulsory school attendance should become topics for discussion in local parish and neighborhood groups. Local parish and neighborhood groups can contribute much toward the thinking of the community in regard to the education and employment of young people. These local groups should study and discuss the educational curricula that is set up for young people. They should discuss employment opportunities for

young people and the relationship of school programs to these opportunities. Education, like employment, cannot be separated from the community. It is something that calls for active participation by all the citizens.



"Teach Ye All Nations"

Few people, we presume, even among Catholics, have a very definite idea of the great evangelization work the Church is doing throughout the world. We know, of course, that missionaries are sent to far-away countries to spread the Faith of Christ, but we have little idea, perhaps, of the vast scale of these missionary endeavors. The following figures were recently released by the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith: "More than 800,000 persons annually embrace the Catholic Faith as the result of labors in the mission fields. The personnel responsible for the great influx into the fold of Christ includes nearly 22,000 priests, 9,000 lay brothers, 53,000 nuns, 76,000 teachers, 92,000 catechists, and 33,000 other assistants."

It was also revealed that in the mission areas there are 97,000 schools attended by more than 5,000,000 pupils. There are 1,000 hospitals with a bed-capacity of 75,000; there are 3,000 dispensaries giving aid annually to 30,000,000 people; 2,000 orphanages housing millions of children; hundreds of leprosaria; hundreds of institutes for the aged; 76,000 churches and chapels; 400 seminaries for native clergy.

This is an impressive army of workers in the Lord's vineyard, but it is only a handful of laborers when one considers the vast work to be done, and the many fields that lie barren because there is no one to cultivate them.—*The SOUTHERN CROSS, Buenos Aires, January 26, 1945.*

Enter Mr. Chesterton

BENEDICT KIELY

Reprinted from THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD*

THE entry of Gilbert Chesterton into English letters was roughly contemporaneous with the commencement of this century, and it may best be symbolized by saying that at a tea party in Saffron Park a young man suddenly discovered that he was vowed (to use his own words) "to the blood-red banner of joy." Any person familiar with the adventures of Gabriel Syme (*The Man Who Was Thursday*) will remember Saffron Park: an abode of aesthetes where the landscape and atmosphere were of a rich decaying autumn. Chesterton was easily and naturally at home in Saffron Park; he could have taken part in the argument on order and anarchy with Gabriel Syme and Lucian Gregory without causing either one or the other to think of him as an interloper and intruder. The case was different with Belloc. He never could have fitted into that world of intellectual decadence, for he brought with him the clean smell of the sea, the thought of the wind blowing in lonely places wider than the world. But Chesterton could have been at home there; and when he arose and came away from Saffron Park, shaking the dust off his feet, the people of that suburb probably lost their ablest defender.

He frequently praised Oscar Wilde as author of the excellent saying: "A cynic is a man who knows the price of everything and the value of nothing." Nor did he neglect to point out how Wilde had pilloried most of his own theories, especially his ideas about interesting women, by that exceptional remark. The young men in the comedies of Wilde knew the price of all things in heaven, on earth and under the earth. They could price an article with all the intuitional accuracy of the bargain-hunting woman, but like her they were often fooled into bringing home with them articles for which they had no earthly use.

Chesterton determined to know the value of things, even if it were only to stare at them in what he might have called the shop-window of the world. The very colors of things, the paints and dyes of Creation had their value. The evil sage might croak himself hoarse in his efforts to prove that the world was a bubble, but Chesterton as a young lover could tell him that if the world was a bubble it had all the gay colors of the rainbow. It was colored blue and green and grey, and he remembered how his lady had clothed herself in these colors.

That is the first significant feature

* 41 & 42 Nassau Street, Dublin, Eire. January, 1945

in those early verses and essays and whirling fantastic tales. He had found the value of things, the benefit of Creation which had been "the greatest of all revolutions." Had he at that time read St. Robert Bellarmine's treatise: "Concerning the Mind's Ascent to God by the Ladder of Created Things," he would but have found himself once more in the position of the man who sailed from England in the lonely boat and came at last to a strange land where he raised his flag on the largest building he could see, only to find that he had annexed the Brighton pavilion. In other words, he would have found his discovery forestalled by the sanest and most comprehensive of all philosophies. But always let it be remembered that Bellarmine was born into the truth. He had behind him sixteen hundred years of tradition. Chesterton came to this realization by going from house to house in the suburb of Saffron Park and by reading the works of Nietzsche and Tolstoi.

REALIZATION OF VALUES

After this realization of the reality and value of things came the consequent realization of the pleasure to be found in that value. Now, truly to feel this pleasure a man must begin by accepting his own imperfection and his share in the common heritage of man. He must not be afraid of crowds, of rank, bustling, vulgar, smelly crowds. He may not be able to rise

to the Johnsonian level of exchanging criticisms with the watermen on the Thames and beating them at their own game, but at least he must never come to speak of watermen and their wives and children as "the populace." The most dangerous of intellectual or spiritual positions, after that of the Albigenian perfect men and women, is the position of the man who knows that he belongs to "the remnant."

On this point the philosophy of Matthew Arnold lacked the comprehensiveness of experience. Even though he was an inspector of schools, perhaps *because* he was an inspector of schools, he always found himself on an eminence looking down on the multitude. That is why the reading of Arnold's poetry so frequently leaves as a result a profound depression of spirits. He said himself that his poetry would never be popular because the populace demanded joy. The populace does demand joy and the demand is something more than a pagan shout for bread and circuses; it is the common desire that was from eternity for a joy in justice that is the fulfilment of being. Even a member of "the remnant" (paying an annual subscription of shattered hopes to that exclusive club) would scarcely be elated by being told that he was a "light half-believer of his casual creed," or that:

... one thing only had been learnt
To Youth and Age in common—
Discontent.

By way of contrast Chesterton wrote:

*The grey leaf falls in pallor but the
green leaf turns to gold,*

*We that have found it good to be
young shall find it good to be old.*

Without the classical training of Arnold, Chesterton had a critical penetration deeper than that of Arnold. He was just as little likely to be caught and held by the worship of sham or to pass over the fact that the golden idol had feet of clay. But a deep understanding of the hearts of men showed him the peculiar position of the man coming into Huddersfield on a wet night and refusing to shelter in anything but a Greek temple.

Yet it would be both unfair and uncritical to think of Matthew Arnold as in any way representative of the decadent mind that was in the literature of the latter 19th century. There was in his poetry a tender sensitive melancholy, in his general criticism a standing-apart from the rank and vulgar that was not in the charity of his life. But it was not against a tender sensitive melancholy that Chesterton reacted. When that melancholy became hopeless, when hopelessness became fear, then it was dangerous. It was against the vague, amorphous fear that pictured man as a tiny dwarf crouching before that immensity of the world he lived in that Chesterton fought.

There is the unavoidable inaccuracy of a generalization in taking one man or one book as representative of a period or a system of thought, but the

method is convenient and brief. For instance: a man wishing to understand the Protestant London-Berlin mentality that after Sedan grew to dominate Europe and later came to be divided against itself, could not better do so than by reading what Carlyle has to say about Martin Luther. And to understand what I may call the "tradition of terror" no better book could be read than *Jude The Obscure*. In the modern world that tradition had its origin in Geneva, when John Calvin formulated a logical dove-tailing theory in which the object of terror was God, the maker of laws. It persisted, until in the land of Wessex Jude Fawley and Sue walked in living terror of the bond that would legalize their love.

It was no small part of the genius of Chesterton that he saw the latter terror to be but the logical outcome of the former; that once the Creator was to be feared, and only feared, little time would pass before all creation would be nothing but grim shadows and lurking deceits. Thomas à Kempis says that a merry evening maketh a sad morning, and Jude and Sue were in the unfortunate position of having the merry evening and the sad morning at the same time. The result was that they got neither the joy of the merry evening nor the sanative repentance of the hang-over. There came a period in English literature when Sue was replaced by Ann Veronica, who may have had many

faults but was troubled with none of the scruples of her predecessor. Yet today we see where the encouragement of Ann Veronica has led modern Europe, and we see that the creator of Ann can give us nothing by way of solace but exceedingly vague speculations about the fate of *Homo Sapiens*. The tradition of terror has succeeded in making the world a place of fear.

Chesterton caught from Stevenson the hint that men, even a man like Long John Silver, certainly men like Alan Breck Stewart or Jim Pinkerton, had no reason to be afraid of the stars in their courses set or of any wandering star. He could hear down the centuries the voice of Falstaff telling the stars that they were, when all was said and done, "the cinders of the element." Again and again Chesterton returns to that idea. It is the one and only explanation of the conduct of Innocent Smith or the adventures of Gabriel Syme. The latter, following a night of terror and bewildering discoveries, comes back again, to reality and sees under the morning sun a red-haired girl picking flowers in a garden "with all the unconscious gravity of a girl." And by that time he has grown so much at home in the universe that he feels not superstitious fear, but calm joy at meeting a red-haired woman in his morning walk.

A man may be surprised at what he sees; he may tread with reverence on the grass and uncover his head to the dandelion, but he must not be afraid.

The world was not a home to Chesterton in the sense of a place where a man might live forever. It was not even the guest-house that Cicero said it was. It was a long, wandering, green-hedged road leading to St. Paul's lasting city which he renamed: "the inn at the end of the world."

The last decade of the 19th century and the first decade of the 20th were the golden age of the pseudo-scientific thriller; and it is no idle comment to say that had Chesterton written "The Sleeper Awakes," it would have been one of the funniest tales ever written. As it was, the excellent author failed to realize the humorous possibilities of a man sleeping for two hundred years and waking to find that he owned the world. And there was always a suspicion that Wells took his nightmares seriously, while Chesterton's nightmares were filled with contorted, grimacing faces that proved in the end as harmless and laughable as the false nose of a circus clown.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY

The effect of the entry of Chesterton on the religious controversy of that time can today be realized by us here in Ireland only after considerable mental effort. Ever since Newman had written the vivid appeal that ended his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*, there had been a hope in the hearts of a small number of men that the Second Spring had really begun. But in time the echoes

of that university conflict faded and were lost in the rising clamor of Modernism and triumphant evolutionary ideas. The mass of the people remained untouched; and the intellectual class who went from hall to hall in pursuit of lectures would have listened to anything but a lecture on Christian doctrine.

Gladstone in his time had made the lament that a tradition of nineteen centuries was now without weapon of attack, standing on a hopeless defensive that was little more than a prolonged death agony. Even an ordinary member of the middle-class, a man like Soames Forsyte, thought of God as a monarch limited by his own Constitution. The characters in Gissing's novel *Born in Exile* held as a platitude that no man could with any sincerity be a Christian. The central character in that depressing tale only pretended Christianity, while he hoped for a higher position in society and sighed for the love of a lady; and when the lady came to the shade of Darwin to be refreshed, matters became decidedly complicated. Pius X spoke of Modernism as "the meeting ground of all the heresies"; and certainly the intellectual life of the London of the 1890's resembled nothing so much as an open market-place for the hucksters and pedlars of philosophies, each man a whole philosophy in himself, shouting aloud the merits of his own particular "line." To one philosophy alone was no booth given at the grand

fair. The religious ideas that had filled and satisfied the soul of Dante were relegated to some dismal shady place inhabited by semi-senile matrons and demonstrative members of the Latin races.

Chesterton entered this marketplace, already admired for some poems that were good enough to be attributed to a poet of repute like Davidson, admired also for a handful of essays defending the indefensible, for a somewhat unintelligible fantasy about the *Napoleon of Notting Hill*. He was admired also for his brilliant, humorous use of paradox, and there was a general suspicion that he had taken upon himself a perpetual defense of the indefensible merely for the sake of exercising his style. At that time he was a Bohemian journalist believing only, as he wrote years afterwards, in the wish to believe. Before long he was to write a book in defense of the Apostles' Creed.

He has been accused again and again of wanton paradox, but the greatest paradox of his life has been completely passed over by his accusers. He was the man who learned the truth by reading the wrong books and associating with the wrong people. He investigated all the theories that the philosophical hucksters had to give him, he read their books and heard their arguments and joined in their conversation, and then with a sigh of relief he turned back to the penny catechism. And to his surprise he

found that the posturing intellectuals would allow virtue to anything under the sun, except to that series of questions and answers and sharp syllogistic arguments.

First of all there was the controversy with Blatchford in which the tradition of nineteen centuries came into Fleet Street. It had a weapon of attack that was nothing more or less than the pointed paradox of the skeptic, made in the new and used in the fight for belief. He comments entertainingly on the controversy in the autobiographical volume that was his last will and testament.

LAUGHED AT SKEPTICISM

Mr. Robert Blatchford was editor of the Socialist *Clarion*. He was a man earnest and sincere in his sympathy for the poor and downtrodden. He saw that the social conditions of the modern world denied both mental and physical comfort to the "under-dog," driving him to vice and crime for which he was scarcely responsible; he inferred that no men were really responsible for their crimes, and having got thus far, it was only a step to the conclusion that crime and sin did not exist.

The conclusion would have caused no comment had not a young writer come forward to argue in defense of the fall of Adam. His method was disconcerting. Monsignor Ronald Knox said that, like the man in Boswell, Chesterton seemed seriously endeavor-

ing to be a philosopher but fun would keep intruding, and the Christian apologetic had hitherto in England been such a timid, solemn affair that the skeptics could only conclude that Chesterton was laughing at the doctrines he pretended to defend. It was a cold bitter realization that later came to them when they discovered he was laughing, not at Christianity, but at Skepticism. He displayed a courage and good humor that not only never departed from him, but that passed on like the magic sword of a fairy tale to younger men who were to follow his footsteps. The whole atmosphere of religious controversy changed and that change was, under God, because of the work of Chesterton.

In the companion volumes *Heretics* and *Orthodoxy* he fought the same battle against greater men than the ingenuous Blatchford. Arnold Lunn, a young man at Oxford, was set thinking by the vigorous argument of those two books. Wilfred Ward read *Orthodoxy* and wrote that the young author would not long remain outside the Catholic Church, although Chesterton said that at that time he had no more notion of becoming a Catholic than of becoming a Mahometan. It seemed at the time extravagant to single out such men as Shaw and Wells and Kipling and, like a skilful doctor finding a bone injury, to put the finger upon the spot where the error was. The error in each case, he claimed, was a religious error. If

men were to go onwards and upwards on the way of Progress, they must have in the mind's eye some determined destination that is the hope of all traveling men, for he saw that if the notabilities of the intellectual world were to be set off by the sound of a starting-pistol, they would race wildly away towards the four quarters of the heavens.

In a world that really believed that the Golden Rule was that there was no Golden Rule, he said that what men needed were eternal standards by which to judge the shifting things of time. In a world that had almost come to what George Eloit, unfairly, said was the Byronic ideal of disordering the stomach and disliking mankind, he cried out in defense of the wonder and beauty and joy of the commonest things—the ears of a donkey, the red pillar-box in the street where lovers hid their secrets. These ideas he had with him at the beginning and at the end; they widened as years passed and came to include things that in earlier times he would not have dreamed of. But the foundation remained the same.

In the last chapter of *Orthodoxy* he said he was as a child playing in his father's garden, asking the endless questions of childhood about the

names of the flowers. When he died in the hot June days of 1936, he had gained the greatest privilege that can be gained by a boy in a garden. He had been admitted to the tool-shed and the secret of Creation was his.

Will his books be read and remembered by generations unborn? Two quotations from his own prose will answer that question as well as it can be answered. The first quotation is taken from the first editorial written for *G. K.'s Weekly*.

There is no nobler fate than to be forgotten as the foe of a forgotten heresy and no better success than to become superfluous; it is well with him who can see his paradox planted anew as a platitude or his fancy shed like a feather when nations renew their youth like the eagles: and when it is no longer thought amusing to say that a farm should belong to a farmer and no longer called brilliant to suggest that a human being might live in his own house as in his own hat, then indeed the trumpets of a final triumph will tell us that we are needed no more.

The second quotation is from an introduction written for a volume of Johnson.

The world will always return to him, almost as it returns to Aristotle; because he also judged all things with a gigantic and detached good sense.

So he wrote of the great Samuel, and we may apply the words as we please.

America and World Communism

REPRESENTATIVE CLAIRE BOOTHE LUCE, of Connecticut

An address delivered over the Blue Network, May 29, 1945

THE other day I saw a reporter-friend just returned from the San Francisco Conference. "Day and night," he said, "there was only one topic: Soviet Russia. Sometimes I wondered if Russia's strength or ideas really merit so much attention."

Of course he knew the answer: they do.

Russia's physical strength has been proven in many mighty battles. We know that America's factories have sent Russia, 12,850 combat vehicles, including tanks, approximately 175,000 guns, and unknown quantities of ships. Altogether American industrial workers and taxpayers have sent \$8,000,000,000 of lend-lease material to our Russian allies. Even so, Russia's own great industry, fine generalship and rich manpower have played a decisive part in the defeat of Germany.

And now the German war machine is destroyed and German industrial strength all but obliterated. This leaves Russia immeasurably the strongest military and industrial power in Europe.

Russia has a fresh, untried and powerful army in Asia. Because it is to Soviet Russia's own national interests to get into the Pacific war, that army is certain to be used against the

Japanese before the final kill. When the Japanese are at last beaten to the ground, their Army destroyed and their factories pulverized, Russia will emerge as the strongest military and industrial power also in Asia.

There is no question that Russian physical strength—her iron muscles and machine brawn—make her the world's No. 2 power, the military and industrial Titan of Eurasia. And this certainly merits the attention it has received from the men who seek peace in our time at San Francisco.

As for Red Russia's ideas—well, at this hour every government in central Europe is either controlled directly or indirectly by Moscow-minded rulers. This has been and is being accomplished by a three-point policy: (1) By a policy of fraternization with the conquered peoples. (2) By the liquidation of all anti-Communists. This means that if people resist Communism, whether they are Fascists, Monarchists, Socialists, Democrats, or Liberals, they are shot, imprisoned, or deported by the tens, and, if necessary, by the hundreds of thousands. (3) By a policy of putting guns, money and food, which is to say, political power, into the hands of all discontented minority groups which

will agree to adopt the Soviet programs, regardless of those groups' previous political convictions.

In Greece and in Italy the groundwork is laid for the Communist or so-called Partisan, Patriot, Free Democratic, or Liberation elements to take over as Anglo-American armies leave.

There are already strong clamorous Communist Parties in Belgium, Holland, France and Spain. In the Near East there is much Communist fire.

The young despairing intellectuals of India are increasingly looking toward their near and mighty neighbor, the Soviet Union, for guidance in the technique of revolution. They get it, increasingly.

We all know that there is a powerful Chinese Communist Party, oriented toward Moscow, whose great opportunity will come when Red Russian armies move against Japan and offer to "liberate" Manchuria.

Mexico, Central America and South America are all well provided with strong Communist groups. I need remind no one that we have our own Earl Browder.

In view of these facts, we must say that Red Russia's ideas merit all the attention they get from the fascinated statesmen of many nations at San Francisco.

Naturally we must ask ourselves: Is this rising world tide of Moscow-controlled Communism a good or evil thing for the world? Upon the in-

dividual American's answer to this question will depend the fate of all the peoples of Europe and Asia in the very immediate years ahead, and the ultimate destiny of America twenty years from now.

GOOD AND EVIL

But before we answer that question let us talk for a moment about words—the words, for example, "good" and "evil."

Do these words have any meaning to you? Of course they do. They are the words men have used since the most ancient times—indeed, since speech itself was born. Now, these words, when applied to fundamental political policies and actions, have about the same meaning to all average Americans. But do they mean the same to us as they do to Communist leaders in Europe or Asia or South America or North America today? The appalling fact is that good and evil not only don't have the same meaning for them—they sometimes have no meaning at all.

Let me give you an example. Do we not all sane men agree that murder is evil? I think we do. When a Nazi SS man seizes a Jew, without due process of law, and throws him into a concentration camp, where he is tortured or starved to death, we say that deed is murder. No Nazi nonsense about racism or international Jewish plots or the security of the Reich can change that very obvious

judgment in the eyes of man or God.

When a Communist OGPU agent strips a Russian of his small farm and few pigs, without due process of law, and then allows him to starve to death, or sends him to a slave camp in Siberia, that deed is murder, too. And no Communist twaddle about implementing the peoples' revolution, international capitalistic plots, or the security of the proletariat should change that judgment in the eyes of man, or can change it in the eyes of God.

The imposed death or imprisonment of any individual who has not been tried by a free jury of his peers under laws which have been framed by the will of the people are, we say again, evil things called murder, called slavery. They were evil when the Nazis practised them. They are evil when the Communists practise them as they do today on a wholesale scale in all of Russia and in central Europe.

FUNDAMENTAL POLITICAL TENETS

Let us get down to three fundamental political tenets, which all Americans hold to be right, good and just.

We believe in a free press, free speech and free worship. The Communists, wherever you find them in America, Mexico, China, or Europe, believe that the press should be censored and controlled; that men should refrain from criticizing their leaders under pain of death; and that

any religion not subject to state control should be liquidated. In short, we and the Communists are exactly 180 degrees apart on our most fundamental political concepts. Moreover, the very words "right," "good," and "just" mean exactly what Stalin says they mean—but only on Monday morning. For on Tuesday morning he may change his mind. If so, the Russian people are required and every Communist leader in the world is required, under pain of death or exile, to change their minds accordingly before Wednesday. For truth to a Communist and Moscow leader is never an absolute. Truth is exactly what suits the Communist leaders' political policy or purposes, or even personal whims, at any given moment.

I expect at this point you will say that in principle you agree with everything I have said. But you say, that's the way the Communists see things. They have the right, haven't they, to see things and do things the way they choose?

If the Moscow Communist leaders and their agents and puppets outside of Russia have the right to communize all of Europe—and then all of Asia—by liquidating all non-Communists; if they have the right to work within all other countries to overthrow their systems of government by force and murder; and if they have the right to plead that this international technique of terrorization and subversion is morally justified by the need of

security for the Soviet Union or the welfare of the masses, then, my friends, should it not logically follow that every other nation had or has that same right?

Well, we never thought the Nazis had this right yesterday. Logically then, we must agree that the Communist dictators don't have it today, either. It is hard to have to display this troublesome moral consistency in our great hour of military victory in Europe, and when our gratitude is so very, very great to the heroic people of Russia, who helped us gain that victory. But a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that we examine the immoral nature of this Communism that is sweeping Europe. And we know that millions upon millions of individual souls there and in Asia are yearning for freedom—the freedom to talk, to speak, to worship, to work at that which lies to their hands or appeals to their minds. Yes, the Russians, too, this valourous and imaginative people—even they are yearning for freedom. Have we any proof of that? We have.

Let me ask you: In this war, did any large group of Americans, any American generals, ever desert American forces to fight with the Japanese or Germans? Never. And yet almost to the end, Russian soldiers by the thousands and Russian generals by the dozens, deserted Red Russia, fled Stalinism, escaped from Communism,

and fought willingly beside the Nazis.

They were, of course, deceived in their search for freedom, just as deceived as the German soldiers who deserted to Stalin. Today in the Balkans over 300,000 Russian soldiers have deserted victorious Russian armies to seek a better, richer, happier way of life. Their search becomes every day more fruitless, because the hand of Stalin reaches out for them, reaches over the Balkans.

Of course, millions of Russians put up a hard fight for their homeland. So did millions of Nazis. So do millions of Japanese. Only Communists would have you believe that the hard fight millions of Russians put up proves that Communism is, therefore, justified. And 180,000,000 Russians are today incarcerated behind a towering wall of censorship. They are unaware that there is a world in which the words "law and justice, charity and freedom" have a sweet and real and personal meaning for great masses of men. Like the Nazis, they have been subjected to years of propaganda and terrorization, or death, if they would not swallow the propaganda. The fate that has overtaken the wonderful Russian people is now about to overtake almost all the peoples of Europe and Asia.

I know what you are thinking now; I can hear your thought.

And what shall we Americans do about it? What can we do about

it? Well, no American wants to go to war about this. But surely we have learned in the last decade that appeasement is the road to war. And if we want to stay out of war with Communism, we must not appease Communism.

First, we can get our own thinking straight. We can, as individuals, write a balance sheet—a strictly moral balance sheet on Communism as it has been revealed in Europe, versus parliamentary and constitutional forms of government. When we have made that balance sheet, we can decide where we each, as individuals, stand. I think morally we will find Communism in the red—blood red. And, then when we've got that balance sheet clear in our minds, we can as individuals help our Government to act abroad.

WHAT TO DO

And what should our Government do abroad?

First and foremost, use our great diplomatic power and vast military prestige—now—to help all Asiatic and European statesmen and officeholders—French, Poles, Italians, Greeks, Belgians, Dutch, Germans, Austrians, who are not either Fascists or Communists, to stay in power providing—and only providing—they are willing to form, and do form, true representative parliaments and congresses, and grant constitutions, which guarantee the people freedom of

press, speech, religion and assembly, and other essential legal rights natural to freedom. Such governments, however imperfect at the beginning, will tend increasingly to respond to the real will of the people.

It is a heartbreaking pity that the heroic but enslaved Russian people—the common men of Russia—are not free to aid us in an effort to enlarge the area of human freedom. But we must understand that the plain people of Russia live in a vast concentration camp, the prisoners of their own leaders. When we remember this, we will never act or speak as some people do, as though the great Russian people were our enemies. The Russian people are and must continue to be our friends, for the peace of the world depends on that friendship. We are the two most powerful peoples on earth, and all our national good will and international diplomatic efforts must be directed toward cementing our friendship. No American wants war again in our generation. But surely in this last decade we have learned in blood and toil and tears and sweat that appeasement is the road to war. If we want to stay out of war with Communism, we must not appease Communism. And we dare not appease Communism. This cannot long remain two worlds, as it is today—the world of totalitarianism and the world of liberty. Indeed, as our conflict with Nazi totalitarianism proved, these two worlds are doomed

to come into conflict. It must, and will be one world sooner or later.

Shall it be one world in which all mankind crawls and cringes in the

darkness of slavery? Or shall it be one world in which all the great nations of mankind love and live in the light of freedom?

An Historical Footnote

On September 28, 1939, Mr. Molotov signed on behalf of the Soviet Union a treaty with Hitler in which Article I read: "The Government of the U.S.S.R. and the German Government establish, as the frontier between their respective state interests in the territory of the *former Polish State*, a line which is marked on the attached map . . ."

Article 2 said: "Both countries *recognize as final* the frontier between their respective state interests as set out in Article I, and will resist any interference with this decision on the part of other powers."

Mr. Molotov again spoke on Poland before the Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1939, and this is what he said: "One swift blow to Poland, first by the German Army, and then by the Red Army, and nothing was left of the ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."



Russia and Lithuania

Russia without any prejudice recognizes the self-rule and independence of the State of Lithuania with all the juridical consequences . . . and for all time renounces with good will all the sovereignty rights of Russia which it has had in regard to the Lithuanian nation or territory.—*Peace Treaty with Russia, Moscow, July 12, 1920.*

Issues Before Christendom

DOUGLAS WOODRUFF

*Reprinted from THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT**

THE particular issues of our own age have re-appeared over and over again since the first century of the Roman Empire in which the infant Church first began to feel her feet. For the first thing that the Church encountered was a singularly jealous state, more totalitarian in theory than in practice, making itself an object of worship and persecuting Christians, on the precise grounds that they had another loyalty, and would not sacrifice to the Divine Emperor. But even in theory the Roman Empire was not totalitarian as Nazism and Marxism are, for it made an immense place for the family and parental authority. The strength of Rome came from the strong type of citizen produced by the Roman Republic, and he was strong as a citizen because he was strong as a father and the head of a household—an independent and responsible agent.

From this generation of Christians to our own, each generation of Christians—and there have been some sixty to seventy distinct generations since Pentecost—has had to grapple with the State and the family and to try to state accurately and translate into human living the proper relationship of the State and the Church and the family towards each other, and to the many lesser associations in which social life is lived. It is an immensely varied story, the pattern changing all the time and dramatically enough after each two centuries or so. The actors have gone, but they have left a wealth of experience and reflection and a good many conclusions behind them, which enable the Catholic to be very much more mature than his contemporaries who are brought up in a briefer and more provincial tradition.

But it has been our misfortune in England that the Catholic tradition was set aside by the controlling authorities in the State four hundred years ago, and it has had to be recovered by an effort and against opposition. The universities which should have been the main places where it was all remembered, discussed, developed and handed on, fell into the hands of men whose great interest was to pretend that there was an admittedly long, but intellectually barren, thousand years about which

* 68 Gloucester Place, London W. 1, February, 1945

educated men do not need to know very much. In my own time at Oxford, twenty years ago, a benefactor's offer to found a Chair of Scholastic Philosophy was promptly and immediately declined by the then Vice-Chancellor.

AN EVIL TRADITION

That Vice-Chancellor was but acting in the tradition which had governed the Universities since the Reformation, of making the least and the worst of the Catholic Church instead of the most and the best, as men should; for the Church was a gift horse to be appreciated. But the minimizing policy has been so successful and pervasive that Catholics themselves who grow up in the atmosphere of modern England, have to re-educate themselves, or they will never understand that the Church is more than it is presented as being, a society which in its day, now many centuries back, exercised a great, and in many ways good influence on our civilization.

That is the conventional picture which Protestants and Agnostics agree upon, and it is certainly an improvement on the Reformation and Whig traditions which saw the Church as a more powerful but also as a more evil influence. But neither picture comes near the truth, which is that our civilization was made by the Church, that the age we live in and have lived in these last two hundred years, is an age of apostasy and decline. We understand it quite easily when anthropologists explain about primitive peoples, that the cycle of their lives and the pattern of their activities all flow from their underlying theological conception of the meaning of life.

A BITTER TRUTH

We understand when we read in antiquity how cultures and civilizations are made by religion. But there is an obstinate sales resistance to the idea that our own civilization is just the same, because if modern men admitted it, they would have to admit that the outlook is black, because, in the other instances, the culture and the civilization does not survive when the religion fades. That is the great thesis which we can illustrate, to bring home to our contemporaries how misleading it is to talk of "the Churches," and to think there are a number of amiable and high-minded voluntary bodies who should be listened to on social and international questions. If we let ourselves be so represented, we shall

be listened to, more or less politely, by men who still go on missing the whole significance of what we have to tell them, which is that the first necessity of the age is to recover its faith, that there can be no easy recipe or guarantee for this, because it is a gift of God; but they can at any rate achieve the pre-disposition and clear their minds of the confusions and obscurities, by which they think that they can continue indefinitely to live parasitically upon the faith and works of their believing forefathers.



Papal Charity

While I am talking about pamphlets, he said, I would like to see one on what the Holy Father has been doing in this war, first for the Jews, and secondly for prisoners of war. It is a terrible shame to hear people saying he has done nothing. Where should we be in this country with regard to our prisoners in Japan had it not been for the work done by the Vatican? I know of several cases where the Holy Father has saved the lives of thousands of Jews.—*Archbishop Griffin.*

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF John LaFarge EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse

With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: William H. Dodd, Henry Watts

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.